

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 338

UD 012 133

AUTHOR Justman, Joseph; Oxman Wendy
TITLE An Evaluation of the ESEA Title I Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools, New York City Board of Education.
INSTITUTION Fordham Univ., Bronx, N.Y. Inst. for Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
REPORT NO Pub-70-26
PUB DATE Aug 70
NOTE 234p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$9.87
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; *Early Childhood Education; Elementary School Students; Individualized Instruction; *Inner City; Kindergarten; Learning Difficulties; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Parent Participation; Primary Grades; Reading Instruction; Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; New York

ABSTRACT

The Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools organized by the New York City Board of Education during the 1969-70 school year constituted a recycling of a similar program conducted during the previous year: both were funded under ESEA Title I programs. The two major objectives of the program were: (1) to improve the academic functioning of children in kindergarten, grade one, and grade two, with special emphasis on the removal of obstacles to learning; and, (2) to involve parents, in a meaningful way, in the education of their children. The objectives were to be achieved by the allocation of additional professional and paraprofessional personnel to those elementary schools designated as poverty area schools by the Council Against Poverty. The kindergarten program provided for more individual instruction for each pupil. A multi-media approach was instituted. Teachers, under the direction of the school principal and the Early Childhood Supervisor, planned meetings and workshops for parents. The program in grades one and two stressed methods of teaching reading and diagnosis of reading difficulty. The paraprofessional, where assigned, was to work in a close relationship with the teacher, assisting in developing improved attitudes and skills. (Author/JM)

ED 059338

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
HARRY N. RIVLIN, DEAN

AN EVALUATION OF THE ESEA TITLE I PROGRAM TO
STRENGTHEN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN
POVERTY AREA SCHOOLS
NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Prepared by

JOSEPH JUSTMAN
Evaluation Director

and

WENDY OXMAN
Research Assistant

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed under contract, with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1969-70 school year.

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
Joseph Justman, Director

Publication No. 70-26

August 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 012133

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION	8
CHAPTER II - THE EVALUATION DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	12
CHAPTER III - THE SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS	19
CHAPTER IV - IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM	29
CHAPTER V - THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM	45
CHAPTER VI - THE PROGRAM IN THE FIRST AND SECOND GRADES	67
CHAPTER VII - ACHIEVEMENT TEST DATA	116
CHAPTER VIII - ORIENTATION AND TRAINING OF STAFF	129
CHAPTER IX - THE ROLE OF THE ECE COORDINATOR	139
CHAPTER X - THE ROLE OF THE PARAPROFESSIONAL	153
CHAPTER XI - PARENT INVOLVEMENT PROGRAMS	160
CHAPTER XII - SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING CHILDREN	166
CHAPTER XIII - RECOMMENDATIONS	168
APPENDIX A - STAFF PARTICIPATING IN EVALUATION PROGRAM	182
APPENDIX B - INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE EVALUATION	184

AN EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM TO STRENGTHEN EARLY
CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN POVERTY AREA SCHOOLS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Previous research and evaluation has highlighted some of the basic deficiencies of children enrolled in early childhood classes in poverty areas:

- a. Deficit in verbal, conceptual, and cognitive development
- b. Need for developing personal and interpersonal relationships with peers as well as with adults in the immediate environment
- c. Need for further development of a sense of self-worth and healthy self-concepts
- d. Need to improve vocabulary, concept development, and other skills requisite for success in reading
- e. Need for meaningful parental involvement in the education of their children

To meet these needs on the kindergarten level, the Program sought to provide more small group and individualized instruction by placing an educational assistant in every kindergarten class in poverty area schools. A multi-media approach was to be utilized to afford children opportunities for varied perceptual experiences (auditory, visual, tactile) and development of the cognitive skills of naming and classifying. Curriculum guides appropriate to the kindergarten level were to be implemented.

On the first grade level, these needs were to be met by reducing pupil-teacher ratios and by providing educational assistant services. For 40 per cent of grade 1 and grade 2 classes, a pupil-teacher ratio of 15 to 1 in grade 1 and of 20 to 1 in grade 2 was to be established. For the remaining 60 per cent of grade 1 and grade 2 classes, a pupil-teacher ratio of 27.2 to 1 was to be established, plus five hours of educational assistant time. The educational assistant was to work in close relationship with the teacher, assisting in the performance of monitorial, clerical, and administrative duties, in providing small group instruction, in supervising games, in handling audio-visual materials, and the like. The functioning of professionals and paraprofessionals as a team was to enrich the quality of the program on these grade levels, and give the teacher maximum time for the development of a sound educational program for the children. The program was to stress reading.

In addition, a program of parent meetings on health and nutrition, as part of a parent involvement program, was to be developed.

B. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools has the following stated objectives:

- a. To improve the academic functioning of children in kindergarten, grade 1, and grade 2, with special emphasis on the removal of obstacles to learning
- b. To involve parents, in a meaningful way, in the education of their children

C. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES

The evaluation design has two major facets:

- a. Determination of the extent to which the program was implemented
- b. Determination of the extent to which the program was successful in attaining its stated goals

In order to determine the extent to which the program was implemented, the following techniques were utilized:

- a. Analysis of official records - data sheet to all schools participating in program to determine nature of organizational patterns established in kindergarten, grade 1, and grade 2; assignment of paraprofessionals
- b. Questionnaires to key personnel in participating schools to determine nature and extent of program
- c. Observation of parent education program and class organization patterns in sample of approximately 30 schools

In order to determine the extent to which the program was successful in attaining its stated goals, the following approaches were utilized:

- a. Observation of on-going program by qualified observers - attention was directed to use of various instructional models (large vs. small group instruction, individualized instruction; use of instructional materials; use of classroom space; use of community and school resources; use of audiovisual aids; provision for experiential learning, etc.); to role of paraprofessional in instructional program (nature of activities to which assigned, rapport with pupil, liaison activities with community, role in small group instruction, etc.); and to observation of parent

workshops (scope and sequence of workshop activities, role of leader, role of parent, provision for active participation, suitability of materials, etc.)

- b. Interviews with and/or questionnaires to participating professionals (early childhood coordinator, classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators) - to determine data concerning training and experience, role in program, reaction to program, etc.
- c. Administration of tests and rating scales - to determine pupil growth. On the kindergarten and first grade levels, this entailed completion of rating scales by teachers in a sample of approximately 30 schools. On the second grade level, pupil performance on Metropolitan Reading tests in sample schools was analyzed; growth of pupils in classes with varying organizational patterns was compared. As a special substudy, growth of pupils now in grade 3 who were in the program during the 1968-1969 school year was studied; performance on the Metropolitan Reading Test given in March 1970 was analyzed.

D. MAJOR FINDINGS

1. The program, as projected in the request for funding, was substantially implemented.
2. On the kindergarten level, ratings assigned to play activities and language activities were generally "good" or "excellent;" learning activities in other content areas, such as mathematics, science, and social studies were less well developed. All but a small proportion of the teachers showed good command of techniques of class management.

Materials were considered in good supply and adequately utilized. The paraprofessional, in the eyes of both observers and professionals, was a potent force in the development of the program.

3. The same comments may be made concerning the program on the first and second grade level. On these grades, as on the kindergarten level, there were some indications that reading and/or reading readiness activities were overemphasized, and that implementation of the suggestions made in curriculum guides concerning development of activities in other content areas had been neglected. There was some evidence, too, that advantages accrued to those classes taught by a single teacher assisted by a paraprofessional, and that considerable difficulty was experienced when paired classes sharing a single room were organized.
4. Test results indicated that the growth of children in reading was satisfactory; relatively greater progress was shown in Word Knowledge than in Comprehension, perhaps reflecting a greater stress on mechanics of reading.
5. Training programs for personnel involved in the Program were a major weakness; in many instances, these programs were too general to meet the specific needs of Early Childhood personnel.
6. The school ECE coordinator, in those schools in which the position was established, proved to be an invaluable asset to the Program.
7. A program of parent involvement was virtually non-existent; those school programs that were organized were not considered effective.
8. Little special provision was made for the non-English speaking child in the Program.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools should be recycled.
2. Individual schools should be given greater leeway in the organization of ECE classes and assignment of personnel; local school districts should not mandate a particular type of organization on the school level.
3. The practice of organizing paired classes should be critically examined, in the light of previous experience in the school, before such classes are established for a successive year.
4. The duties and functions of the ratio or cluster teacher should be clarified, and a program in which the ratio teacher is used as a team member, rather than as a "fill-in", should be developed.
5. Current kindergarten programs should be modified to reflect less emphasis on reading and/or reading readiness, and greater emphasis on structured and sequential activities in content areas.
6. Similar revisions should be made of the existing programs in first and second grade.
7. Provide for a comprehensive program of training of personnel participating in the program; if possible, provide a position of teacher trainer.
8. Mandate the establishment of a position of ECE coordinator in all schools participating in the Program.
9. Continue the present practice of assigning a paraprofessional to every kindergarten class; extend the assignment of paraprofessionals to all first and second grade classes participating in the Program.

10. Establish programs of parent involvement in all schools participating in the program; strengthen existing programs involving parents.
11. Provide training in teaching English as a Second Language in all schools in which a substantial proportion of the children are non-English speaking.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools (SECE) organized by the Board of Education of the City of New York during the 1969-1970 school year constituted a recycling of a similar program conducted during the previous school year. Both the 1968-1969 and 1969-1970 programs were funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). For the 1969-1970 school year, the program was assigned Function #911653.

The SECE program was planned through the joint efforts of the Bureau of Early Childhood Education, the Office of Elementary Schools, the Program Development Unit of the Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs, the Bureau of Special Reading Services, and the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit.

A. Program Goals

The program goals, the objectives to be attained by the program, were based on an analysis of observed needs of children enrolled in Early Childhood Education classes. The basic needs common to such children in poverty area schools were identified as follows:

1. Need to overcome deficits in verbal, conceptual, and cognitive development; limited vocabulary; paucity of names for every day objects;
2. Need for developing personal and interpersonal relationships with a peer group as well as with adults in the immediate environment; social and emotional development;

3. Need to develop critical thinking and problem solving;
4. Need to develop a feeling of self-worth and an internalized code of behavior;
5. Need for parental and community involvement as a means of providing insights in their children's learning.

Consideration of these needs led to the formulation of the following two major objectives of the SECE program, summarized in the request for funding submitted by the Board of Education:

1. To improve the academic functioning of children in kindergarten, grade 1, and grade 2, with special emphasis on the removal of obstacles to learning;
2. To involve parents, in a meaningful way, in the education of their children.

B. Program Procedures

The objectives stated above were to be achieved by the allocation of additional professional and paraprofessional personnel to those elementary schools designated as poverty area schools by the Council Against Poverty. Additional teachers and paraprofessionals were to be assigned as follows:

1. An educational assistant was to be assigned to each kindergarten class;
2. For 40 per cent of grade 1 and of grade 2 classes, a pupil-teacher ratio of 15 to 1 (in grade 1) and of 20 to 1 (in grade 2) was to be established;
3. For the remaining 60 per cent of grade 1 and grade 2 classes, a pupil-teacher ratio of 27.2, plus 5 hours per day of educational assistant time, was to be established.

Some flexibility was permitted in meeting these standards. Decisions concerning assignment of additional teachers and paraprofessionals were to be made by the local district superintendent. Depending on the needs of a given eligible school, an additional "ratio" teacher could be assigned in lieu of educational assistants. In instances where such a conversion was made, one teacher was considered as replacing 20 hours of educational assistant time daily.

The Kindergarten Program. Wherever possible, kindergarten classes were to be organized on a $2\frac{1}{2}$ hour basis rather than on the usual 3 hour A.M., 2 Hour P.M. session. The teacher, assisted by the assigned paraprofessional, was to provide more individualization of instruction for each pupil. A multi-media approach was to be instituted, in order to provide children varied opportunities for the development of auditory, visual, and tactile perceptual skills, and of the cognitive skills of naming and classifying. The Prekindergarten-Kindergarten Curriculum Guide, Language Arts, Family Living, Science K-2, and the Kindergarten History and Social Science bulletins were to be implemented.

In addition, kindergarten teachers, under the direction of the school principal and the Early Childhood Supervisor, were to plan meetings and workshops for parents dealing with such subjects as program development for five-year-olds, and the role and responsibility of the school and the home. When requested by parents, the teacher was to organize meetings involving other bureaus and agencies.

The Program in Grade 1 and Grade 2. The program on these grade levels was to stress reading, methods of teaching reading, and diagnosis of reading difficulty. The paraprofessional, in those classes where an educational

assistant was assigned, was to work in a close relationship with the teacher, assisting her in developing improved attitudes, skills, and habits. The paraprofessional was also to relieve the teacher of some monitorial, clerical, and administrative duties. Under the direction of the classroom teacher, the educational assistant was to assist in:

- a. Giving small group instruction
- b. Maintaining wholesome classroom discipline
- c. Operating audio-visual materials
- d. Providing supervision at games and on trips
- e. Giving bi-lingual instruction where required

Training of Paraprofessionals. The funding proposal submitted for the SECE program describes an inservice training program for educational assistants in considerable detail. The adequacy of this inservice program is evaluated elsewhere.

CHAPTER II

THE EVALUATION DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

In view of the fact that there were 291 schools in New York City that were eligible for participation in the SECE program, one would expect to find considerable variation in the manner, as well as in the degree to which the program was implemented in the several schools. Variations that might be encountered would include "paired" classes, in which two teachers were assigned to a single classroom, and single teacher classrooms. In both of these types of classrooms, considerable variation might also be noted in the number of pupils occupying places in the classroom, and in the amount of paraprofessional time allotted to the class. Moreover, one might observe differences from school to school in the assignment of extra teaching personnel in the form of "ratio", "cluster", and "quota" teachers to assist in the educational program at a given grade level.

Actually, after reviewing the data submitted by the schools, the following seven patterns of administrative implementation were identified:

1. All classes on a given grade were "paired" classes
2. All classes on a given grade were single teacher classes, with an educational assistant assigned
3. All classes on a given grade were single teacher classes, with no educational assistant assigned
4. Both "paired" and single teacher classes were organized on a given grade, some with and some without paraprofessional assistance
5. All classes on a given grade were single teacher classes, some with and some without paraprofessional assistance

6. Both "paired" and single teacher classes were organized on a given grade, all of the latter afforded the services of a paraprofessional
7. Both "paired" and single teacher classes were organized on a given grade, none of which were afforded the services of a paraprofessional

The design that was developed for the evaluation of the SECE program sought to determine the most advantageous allocation of space, personnel, and pupil population on the kindergarten, first, and second grade levels, utilizing the following criteria: pupil achievement in reading (where measurable), observer ratings of program effectiveness, and administrator and teacher ratings of effectiveness.

Although the nature of the SECE program did not permit experimentation by means of experimental and control groups, subgroup comparisons were made to assess the effects of variations in the implementation of the program. Such a "comparative" approach, to be sure, is limited by the non-random selection of subgroups for comparison, and thus by the possibly erroneous assumption that the groups are equal within statistically determinable limits in all respects except that of exposure to each treatment. However, it was felt that information from an analysis such as this, combined with knowledge of some of the possible sources of experimental error, would provide valuable information.

The design developed for the evaluation of the SECE program had two major facets:

1. Determination of the extent to which the program was implemented with respect to:
 - a. Assigning a paraprofessional in kindergarten classes

- b. Establishing a pupil-teacher ratio of 15 to 1 in 40 per cent of first grade classes
 - c. Establishing a pupil-teacher ratio of 20 to 1 in 40 per cent of second grade classes
 - d. Establishing a pupil-teacher ratio of 27.2 to 1 and assigning an educational assistant in the remaining 60 per cent of first and second grade classes
 - e. Developing a program of parent involvement.
2. Determination of the extent to which the program was successful in attaining its stated goals of:
- a. Improving the academic functioning of children; and
 - b. Involving parents in the education of their children.

A. Samples Used in the Evaluation

Three different samples were utilized in various phases of the evaluation:

- 1. Total Sample - in order to obtain data concerning several aspects of the extent of implementation of the program, a total sample, comprising all 291 participating schools, was used.
- 2. Intensive ("Core") Sample - in order to obtain intensive data concerning effectiveness of the program by means of observation and interviews with administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals, a sample of 32 schools was selected. This sample included one or two schools representing each of the participating districts in the program; each school was selected within its district as a clear example of one of the seven previously identified patterns of administrative organization.

3. Questionnaire ("Mail") Sample - using the same purposive procedure, according to district and pattern, a sample of 100 schools was also selected. This sample was utilized for the collection of data by means of mailed questionnaires.

B. Data Collection Techniques

A variety of approaches were utilized in the collection of data for the evaluation:

1. Analysis of official records - in order to obtain data concerning implementation of the program, a data sheet, calling for a summary of the organizational pattern in ECE classes, was sent to the total sample of 291 schools participating in the program.
2. Observation - in order to appraise the effectiveness of the program in operation, qualified observers visited each of the 32 schools in the intensive sample. In each school, two kindergarten, three first grade, and three second grade classes were observed. In each of the first and second grade classes, one lesson in reading and one lesson in some other subject area were seen. A specially prepared observation schedule was utilized to summarize observed lessons. In addition, an overall appraisal of the educational functioning of each classroom was made by the observer, again utilizing a specially prepared form. (Copies of the instruments used by the observers appear in the Appendix.)
An orientation session was conducted for the observers, at which the objectives of the program were described and the instruments to be used were discussed.

In all, 18 observers gave a total of 192 days to school visits. The observers included 14 members of the staffs of teacher training institutions in the Metropolitan area, all of whom had had considerable experience on the early childhood level, two former principals of New York City public schools, and two former teachers in New York City schools, both of whom had had extensive experience on the ECE level and had done responsible work in teacher training and curriculum development.

3. Questionnaires - in order to obtain additional data concerning program implementation, as well as the reactions of program participants, a series of questionnaires were sent to the principal, assistant principal, school ECE coordinator (if any), and to selected teachers and educational assistants in each of the 100 schools in the questionnaire sample. (Copies of the questionnaire may be found in the Appendix.)

A questionnaire was also sent to the District ECE Supervisor in each of the districts participating in the program. In this questionnaire, emphasis was placed upon district involvement in the program. (A copy of the questionnaire also appears in the Appendix.)

4. Interviews - in addition to observing classes in the intensive sample of 32 schools, the observers conducted a series of interviews with school personnel. Using the questionnaires described above as interview schedules, the observer interviewed the principal, assistant principal, school ECE coordinator (if any) and the

the teachers and paraprofessionals in the classes that were observed.

5. Analysis of Test Results - data concerning pupil performance on standardized achievement tests in reading were available only on the second grade level. These data, for the schools in the intensive "core" sample, were analyzed.

In addition, at the request of the Bureau of Educational Research, a separate analysis was made of the growth in reading of a small sample of children, presently in grade 3, who were program participants in grade 2. These data were available for nine schools in the intensive sample.

C. Data Analysis

The instruments described above provided a wealth of detailed descriptive data concerning the nature and extent of implementation of the program, as well as reactions of participating personnel and observers concerning the effectiveness of the program. Using as criteria the appraisals furnished by school personnel and by the observers, as well as the achievement scores of the children in the intensive sample of participating schools, a number of subgroup comparisons concerning the effectiveness of the program were made. The specific questions to which attention was directed may be summarized as follows:

1. Are there significant differences in the effectiveness of the SECE program, as measured by the criterion ratings and the achievement scores, between:
 - a. Paired classes and single teacher classes
 - b. Classes with paraprofessionals and classes without paraprofessionals

- c. Paired classes and single teacher classes with paraprofessionals
- d. Classes of different sizes

Where appropriate, analysis of variance was employed to determine the significance of differences between groups and interactions between them. In those instances in which the assumptions of a parametric test were not met, a chi-square approach was utilized.

CHAPTER III

THE SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS

Before turning to a consideration of the findings of the evaluative study, it might be well to describe the respondents to the interviews that were conducted and to the questionnaires that were mailed.

In each of the 32 intensive, or "core" sample schools, interviews were conducted by a member of the observation team, where possible, with the principal, the primary assistant principal and the ECE Coordinator, as well as with the teachers and paraprofessionals in each of the two kindergartens and three first and second grade classes in which observations were conducted.

Questionnaires were sent to a "Mail" sample of 100 schools to be returned by the principal, the assistant principal, the ECE Coordinator, by two teachers on each of the kindergarten, first, and second grade levels, and by three paraprofessionals assigned to ECE classes.

The questionnaire form mailed to administrators and teachers in the "mail" sample, and the interview schedule utilized by the observers in the "core" sample were identical; thus, detailed information regarding the implementation and effectiveness of the program was solicited from a total of 132 schools. Three of the "mail" sample schools had to be eliminated for various reasons, reducing the total number of schools in the total sample to 129.

Questionnaires were also sent to the District ECE Supervisors in each of the 29 participating districts, and were returned by Supervisors in 14 districts. In one district, two Supervisors shared the responsibilities

for the Early Childhood programs, and each provided information regarding the SECE program.

In two cases, it was not possible to interview the principal of the schools in the core sample; thus, a total of 29 (90.6%) principal interviews were conducted. Of the principals in the 97 schools from which information was solicited by mail, 77 (79.4%) returned questionnaires. Data regarding the SECE programs was furnished by a total of 106 principals of participating schools.

Information was collected from a total of 90 assistant principals having some responsibility for the early childhood classes in their schools. In some schools, however, no assistant principal was assigned this role; in others, two assistant principals shared the responsibilities for these classes, and each responded to the questionnaire or interview. It was not possible, therefore, to estimate the proportion of respondents to the total number of assistant principals in the participating schools.

The exact number of teachers serving as ECE coordinators in the sample schools was not known. However, principals in 45 (58.4%) of the 77 schools from which principal questionnaires were received, and in 16 (55.2%) of the 29 schools in which interviews with principals were conducted, indicated that they had been able to assign a teacher to fill the position of ECE coordinator in their schools. It was estimated, therefore, that approximately 57.5 per cent or 74 of the 129 participating schools had the services of an ECE coordinator. Sixty-one ECE coordinators furnished information; 18 were interviewed in the core sample schools, and 43 responded to the mail questionnaire.

The observation team was directed to conduct interviews with each

teacher in each of two kindergarten and three first and three second grade classes visited in the core sample schools.

Interviews were conducted with 67, 123, and 115 teachers on the kindergarten, grade 1, and grade 2 levels, respectively. The number of interviews conducted with teachers in the core sample schools was determined by the nature of the classes visited; each of the two teachers of paired classes were interviewed; in some cases, interviews were conducted with ratio or cluster teachers.

Questionnaire responses were received from an additional 118 kindergarten teachers; 117 first grade, and 109 second grade teachers in the "mail" sample schools. These responses constituted a 60.8 per cent return of the kindergarten teachers questionnaires, a 60.3 per cent return of the first grade teacher questionnaires, and a 56.2 per cent return of the second grade teacher questionnaires that were mailed.

Members of the observation team interviewed 152 paraprofessionals assigned to the classes which they observed; again, the number of paraprofessionals interviewed was determined by the type of classes observed.

It was not possible to estimate the proportion of paraprofessionals responding to the mail questionnaire to the total number of paraprofessionals participating in the SECE Program, as the total number of paraprofessionals employed in the sample schools was not known. The number of paraprofessionals responding to the mail questionnaire was 179. Responses from a total of 331 paraprofessionals were available for analysis; of these, 146 (44.1%) were assigned to kindergarten, 96 (29.0%) were assigned to first grade classes, and 87 (26.2%) to second grade classes. Two respondents (0.6%) were not primarily assigned to serve in ECE classrooms.

Table III-1 summarizes the information available regarding data collection in the "core" and "mail" sample schools.

Table III-1

Data Collected Through Interview and
Questionnaire Techniques in Sample Schools

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Interviews Conducted in 32 Core Sample Schools</u>	<u>Questionnaires Returned from 97 Mail Sample Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>
Principal	29	77	106
Assistant Principal			90
ECE Coordinator	18	43	61
Kindergarten teacher	67	118	185
Grade 1 teacher	123	117	240
Grade 2 teacher	115	109	224
Paraprofessional	152	179	331

Preliminary analysis of the data collected through interviews in the "core" sample schools and by questionnaire in the "mail" sample schools revealed few differences between the data reported by personnel in the two samples. It was decided, therefore, to consolidate the two samples into one total sample in the presentation of descriptive data regarding the implementation and effectiveness of the SECE Program.

A. BACKGROUND OF THE PARTICIPANTS

1. Principals

Of the 106 principals in the sample schools, 98 or 92.5% reported that they held graduate degrees. The average number of graduate credits completed was 67.7.

A total of 91 (85.8%) reported previous experience as principal; of these, the average number of years of experience prior to the current school year as principal was 6.8 years. A total of 99 principals reported prior experience as assistant principal; of these, a mean of 7.0 years of experience as assistant principal was reported.

Previous experience as elementary school teachers (K-6) was reported by 70 (66.0%) of the principals; these principals had served an average of 10.8 years as elementary school teachers. Only 13 principals (12.3%) indicated prior experience teaching as Early Childhood Education teachers. The principals with such experience had served an average of 5.5 years in this role.

As a group, then, the principals constituted a very experienced body of men and women, both as administrators and elementary school teachers, although relatively few had served as ECE teachers.

2. Assistant Principals

Information regarding the background and experience of 90 assistant principals involved with the SECE program was obtained.

Of the 90 assistant principals, 24 (26.7%) were male, and 66 (73.3%) female. A mean of 55.6 graduate credits was reported by 87 (96.7%) respondents; 76 (84.4%) held a graduate degree.

A total of 83 (92.0%) of the assistant principals reported prior experience in this role; of these, a mean of 6.0 years of experience was reported. All but three of the assistant principals with prior experience served previously in this capacity in the same school.

Nearly all (87, or 96.7%) of the assistant principals responding reported previous experience as elementary school (K-6) teachers; 13.3

years, on the average. An average of 7.1 years of previous experience in teaching early childhood classes was reported by 56 of the 90 respondents.

The assistant principals, too, constituted a group with considerable experience, both in their present position and as former elementary school teachers. Rather surprisingly, approximately three-fifths of the group had served as ECE teachers; this would mean that almost all of the women serving as assistant principals had had some experience on the ECE level.

3. ECE Coordinators

Of the 61 ECE coordinators for whom information was available, 28 (45.9%) held a graduate degree. A mean of 40.2 graduate credits was reported by 51 respondents.

All but two ECE coordinators had previously taught in kindergarten through second grade; for an average of 13.1 years. Half of the group had also had experience teaching in grades 3 through 6. An average of 12.5 years of previous experience in the same school was reported by the 61 ECE coordinators, all of whom had prior experience in that school. Only one had not previously served as ECE coordinator; the mean number of years of prior experience as ECE coordinator reported by the 60 with this experience was 2.4 years. In view of the relatively short length of time that the schools have been able to assign a teacher to serve as an ECE coordinator, this represents considerable prior experience.

4. Teachers

Of the 185 kindergarten teachers sampled, 74 (40.0%) held a graduate degree. A total of 147 (79.5%) had completed graduate courses; a mean

of 27.9 graduate credits had been completed. Graduate degrees were held by 64 (26.7%) of the 240 responding first grade teachers. A mean of 25.6 graduate credits were reported by 189 (78.7%) grade 1 teachers. Fifty-four of the 224 second grade teachers (24.1%) held graduate degrees. A mean of 23.8 graduate credits was reported by the 219 (97.8%) of the second grade teachers responding.

Fully 98.3 per cent (all but 4) of the first grade and 95.5 per cent (all but 10) of the second grade teachers were female.

Information regarding the licenses under which the participating teachers served are presented in Table III-2.

Table III-2

Teaching License of Participating Teachers

	Early Childhood	Common Branches	Not Given
Kindergarten (N=185)	142	41	2
Grade 1 (N=240)	79	151	10
Grade 2 (N=224)	50	169	5

Table III-3 presents data regarding the prior teaching experience reported by kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 teachers in the SECE program.

Table III-3

Prior Teaching Experience of Participating Teachers

	KINDERGARTEN (N=185)			GRADE 1 (N=240)			GRADE 2 (N=224)		
	N	Per Cent	Mean Years	N	Per Cent	Mean Years	N	Per Cent	Mean Years
Teachers with prior experience	176	95.1	8.7	220	91.7	5.7	196	87.5	4.1
Teachers with prior experience in same school	169	91.4	5.2	207	86.3	3.9	191	85.7	3.1
Teachers with K-2 experience	175	94.6	7.2	208	86.7	5.2	167	74.6	3.4
Teachers with no prior experience	9	4.9		20	8.3		28	12.5	

Again, the mean experience reported by the group is relatively high. Very few of the respondents are beginning teachers and, particularly on the kindergarten level, are well beyond the probationer level. In common with a phenomenon noted in many other studies, the second grade teachers reporting tend to show the least experience.

5. Paraprofessionals

Data were available regarding the background and experience of 331 paraprofessionals; all but three of whom were female.

Data regarding the educational background of the 331 paraprofessionals are presented in Table III-4.

Table III-4

Highest Level of Schooling Completed by
Paraprofessionals Participating in SECE Program (N=331)

	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Completed One Year of High School	2	0.6
Completed Two Years of High School	3	0.9
Completed Three Years of High School	7	2.1
Held High School Diploma	166	50.2
Completed Some College Work	141	44.9
Held Degree from a Two Year College	9	2.7
Held Degree from a Four Year College	3	0.9

Of the 331 paraprofessionals, 291 (87.9%) had had experience as educational assistants or teacher aides prior to the current school year. Those with this experience, had served an average of 2.4 years in this capacity. A total of 309 paraprofessionals reported prior experience in the same school; some included their association with the school as parents or volunteers. A mean of 3.0 years of prior experience in the same school was reported.

The paraprofessionals also tend to be a relatively experienced group, when viewed in terms of the length of time such assignments have been available in the schools. In terms of educational background, too, the group shows school work well above the average of the usual layman. All but 12 respondents reported holding a high school diploma, while almost one-half of the respondents noted that they had completed some college work. It is probably that, for most of the paraprofessionals, this college work represents attendance in the Career Ladder program.

6. District ECE Supervisors

Of the 15 District ECE Supervisors responding, 12 (6.0%) held Master's degrees. All had completed graduate credits; the mean number of credits reported was 40.9.

Three (20.0%) of the District ECE Supervisors had been newly appointed at the beginning of the 1969-70 school year; the twelve with previous experience in this role had served an average of 6.2 years as District ECE Supervisor, all but one in the same district. With the exception of this one District ECE Supervisor, who had 5 years of experience in this role in another district, all the District ECE Supervisors had prior experience in the same district.

Two Supervisors chose not to list their prior years of teaching experience; of the 13 who provided this information, an average of 14.1 years as an elementary school teacher and 13.3 years teaching early childhood classes was reported. Eight had taught only in early childhood classes, the remaining five had taught in grades 3-6.

In general, then, the respondents to interviews and questionnaires tended to be an above average group in terms of educational background and experience. Taken as groups, the administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals to whom questions were directed had sought educational training well above the requirements for the positions that they held. In addition, they had generally served in their posts in their present schools for long enough periods to provide the stability and perspective needed by any program that is introduced.

CHAPTER IV

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

As a first step in the evaluation of the SECE program, attention was directed to a consideration of the extent to which the projected program was implemented. Data concerning the extent of implementation were gathered via a questionnaire sent to all schools participating in the program, and through follow-up telephone interviews in those instances where the questionnaire data were incomplete. In all, 291 schools were designated as eligible for participation in the program; usable data concerning implementation were received from 274 (92.4%) of these eligible schools.

A. Implementation at the Kindergarten Level

A total of 1,897 classes were organized on the kindergarten level in the schools participating in the program. Of these, all but 21 (1.1%) were accorded the services of an educational assistant (see Table IV-1). The indications are, then, that the goal concerning assignment of paraprofessionals to all kindergarten classes in poverty area schools was substantially fulfilled. In several instances, reports from the schools indicated that difficulty in recruitment was the reason for failure to assign a paraprofessional on this level. In view of the fact that these data were collected early in November 1969, it is very likely that some additional educational assistants were assigned to unserved classes later in the school year.

Class Size. It is interesting to note the distribution of pupil registers in these kindergarten classes. Of the 1,897 classes organized, 453 (23.8%) enrolled less than 20 children, 851 (44.9%) enrolled between 20 and 24

children, and 588 (31.0%) had registers between 25 and 29. Only five classes, approximately one-fourth of one per cent of all the kindergarten classes, had pupil registers of 30 or more.

Table IV-1

Distribution of Kindergarten Classes Participating in SECE Program

Dist.	No. of Schools	Number of Pupils on Register							
		Less than 20		20-24		25-29		30 or more	
		Para Assigned Yes	Para Assigned No	Para Assigned Yes	Para Assigned No	Para Assigned Yes	Para Assigned No	Para Assigned Yes	Para Assigned No
1	13	29		28		11			
2	7	30		8		2			
3	6(b)	7		10		5			
4	13	15		43		16			
5	15(c)	32		38		21			
6	11(a)	22		25		39			
7	17(a)	11		50		53			
8	9	17		40		21			
9	13	20		50		34			
10	2	4		8		4			
11	1	2		2					
12	14(b)	24		50		49			
13	16(a)	13		51	3	40	1		
14	19	46		58		22			
15	16	18	4	48	4	32	2		
16	22	12	1	72		76			
17	10(a)	6		63		23			
18	7	18		16		9		1	
19	18(a)	17		64		57			
20	0(a)					6			
21	3	12				13			
23	6(a)	14		22		2		4	
24	2			12		10			
27	7	19		19		8			
28	4	19		7		12			
29	7	10		20		4			
30	5(a)	15		11	2	8			
31	3(a)			6		2			
32	6	8		18	2	2			
33	2(a)	8		1		2			
Total	274	448		5	840	11	581	7	5

- (a) One school not reporting
 (b) Two schools not reporting
 (c) Three schools not reporting

"Paired" vs "Single" Classes. The data reported by the schools made it possible to determine the extent to which kindergarten classes were "paired" (two classes sharing the same room) or "single" (one teacher in a room). These data are summarized in Table IV-2.

Table IV-2

Distribution of "Paired" and "Single" Kindergarten Classes
Participating in SECE Program

District	No. of Classes	Number of Pupils on Register							
		Less than 20		20-24		25-29		30 or more	
		Paired	Single	Paired	Single	Paired	Single	Paired	Single
1	68	4	25		28		11		
2	40	4	26		8		2		
3	22		7		10		5		
4	74		15		43		16		
5	91	6	26	2	36		21		
6	86		22		21	4	39		
7	114	6	5	6	44		53		
8	78	10	7	16	24		21		
9	104	20		32	18		34		
10	16		4	8			4		
11	4		2		2				
12	123	21	3	11	35	4	49		
13	108	4	9	4	50		41		
14	126	24	22		58		22		
15	108		22	4	48		34		
16	161		13	4	68		76		
17	92		6	17	46		23		
18	44		18		16		9		1
19	138	4	13	16	48		57		
21	18		12				6		
23	49	14		2	20		13		
24	18				12		2		4
27	48	16	3	4	15		10		
28	34	19		3	2	2	8		
29	42	8	2		20		12		
30	32		15		13		4		
31	14				6		8		
32	34	4	4	4	16		6		
33	11		8		1		2		
Total	1,897	164	289	133	708	10	588	0	5

It is evident that the "single" teacher per class pattern is by far the more prevalent type of class organization on the kindergarten level. Of the 1,897 kindergarten classes for which data were available, 1,590 (83.8%) took this form. All but 10 of the 593 classes with pupil registers of 25 or more were "single" teacher classes.

A total of 307 (16.2%) of the classes were "paired," with two teachers sharing responsibility for two classes using the same room at the same time. In 164 (53.4%) of these 307 classes, the combined registers of the two classes did not exceed 39; in 133 (43.3%) of these classes, the combined registers were between 40 and 49. The combined registers exceeded 50 in only 5 instances.

The available data also make it possible to determine whether paraprofessionals were assigned to "paired" or "single" classes. Of the 21 classes functioning without an educational assistant, 16 (76.2%) were taught by a single teacher. Five of these classes enrolled less than 20 pupils; the remainder had between 20 and 24 children on register.

B. Implementation on the First Grade Level

The goal of the SECE program, it will be remembered, was to establish classes with a pupil-teacher ratio of 15 to 1 in 40 per cent of all grade 1 classes, and to maintain a pupil-teacher ratio of 27.2, with added assistance in the form of a paraprofessional, in the remaining 60 per cent of the classes. The local district superintendent was given the option of utilizing "ratio" teachers in place of educational assistants. In instances where such a replacement was made, the services of a "ratio" teacher was considered to be equivalent to 20 hours of educational assistant time per day.

It soon became evident, in analyzing the data submitted by the participating schools, that the concept of "ratio" teacher was interpreted in varying fashion. The terms "ratio," "cluster," "floating," and "quota" teacher were apparently used interchangeably, and, in more than a few instances, teachers in an ATR (Absent Teacher Reserve) category were also looked upon as "ratio" teachers. In view of this confusion, it was deemed advisable to deal with the available data in terms of pupil registers, rather than in terms of pupil-teacher ratios.

One other stipulation was made in considering implementation of the SECE program. In view of the high mobility of the pupil population, it was felt that many principals would find it extremely difficult to establish and maintain pupil registers at an exact level. Accordingly, it was deemed advisable to consider any first grade classes in which the register fell below 20 as having substantially met the requirements of the directive concerning the establishment of a class register of 15.

Table IV-3 presents a distribution of the number of first grade classes of given registers in schools participating in the program and, in addition, indicates whether paraprofessional help was made available to these classes.

Table VI-3

Distribution of First Grade Classes Participating in SECE Program

Dist.	No. of Schools	Number of Pupils on Register							
		Less than 20		20-24		25-29		30 or more	
		Para Assigned Yes	No	Para Assigned Yes	No	Para Assigned Yes	No	Para Assigned Yes	No
1	12	1	7	21	11	12	11	4	
2	7	2	6	5	8	5	5	1	3
3	5	3		5	1	12			
4	11	17	13	8	1	19	3	6	
5	14	7	5	7	20	31	12	2	2
6	10	12	4	1		22	16	10	16
7	17		10	11	5	47	11	35	3
8	9		49	4	2	13	22	10	
9	12	4	37	16	17	17	26	8	2
10	2					2		8	
11	1			2		2			
12	14	12	11	17	2	35	2	48	7
13	16	8	17	25	16	34	5	25	
14	19	7	30	15	25	28	23	6	4
15	16	10	29	5	6	22	15	16	1
16	22			7	1	105		58	
17	8		6	5		21	5	26	4
18	7	9	3	12		21	1	5	
19	18	22	33	12	12	38	18	22	8
21	3	1	1	2	6	1	7		
23	5	6	14	3	4	5	2	4	
24	2		6			7		2	
27	5			4	2	7	3	11	2
28	4		10	1	1	6	5	7	
29	7			12	2	20		7	
30	7		11		3	1	5		5
31	3	1	1	1	5	4	3		
32	4		4	9	3	10	2	2	1
33	2		1	5	2	2			
Total	262	122	308	215	155	549	202	323	58

A total of 262 schools reported data that could be summarized in Table IV-3. In five additional schools, early childhood classes were organized on a non-graded basis; these schools have not been included in the tabulation.

Class Size. A total of 1,932 classes were organized on the first grade level. Of these, 430 (22.3%) reported registers of less than 20, and were deemed to have met the goal of the program. The indications are, then, that this objective was not attained, taking the schools as a group. When the data for individual districts are examined, it appears that five districts (Districts 4, 8, 23, 24, and 30) were able to attain the stated goal.

In most instances, classes on the first grade level enrolled between 25 and 29 pupils. Of the 1,932 classes, 751 (38.9%) were of this size. An additional 370 classes, 19.2 per cent of the total, had between 20 and 24 pupils on register. Rather surprisingly, the reports from the schools listed 381 classes with registers of 30 or over; these classes constituted 19.7 per cent of the total number of first grade classes.

To what extent was the objective of class size not exceeding 27.2 met on this level? For the schools taken as a group, this goal was attained, although there was considerable variation from district to district. In twelve of the districts, average class size of those classes which enrolled 20 or more pupils exceeded the 27.2 level.

It must be remembered, in evaluating these findings, that the data deal with size of class (pupil registers) rather than with pupil-teacher ratios. As such, a far more stringent criterion has been utilized in determining the extent to which the goal of the program was attained. Had it been possible to determine the exact number of "ratio" teachers assigned to first grade classes in each school, the number of such classes meeting the twin standards of a 15 to 1 pupil-teacher ratio or of a 27.2 pupil-teacher ratio would have been much greater.

Assignment of Paraprofessionals. It is also interesting to note the data concerning the assignment of paraprofessionals to first grade classes. In all, 1209 (62.6%) of the 1,932 first grade classes received the services of an educational assistant. It should be noted, however, that 122 of these classes had pupil registers of less than 20; indeed, 28.4 per cent of these 430 small classes were accorded paraprofessional services. Again, there was considerable variation among districts; paraprofessional assignments were limited to classes with registers of 20 and over in 13 of the 29 districts participating in the program.

In general, assignments of educational assistants were made with greater frequency as class size increased. In the case of the 370 classes with class size between 20 and 24 pupils, 215 (58.1%) received paraprofessional help. Such assistance was also given to 549 (73.1%) of the 751 classes with registers of 30 and above. In all, 994 (66.2%) of the 1,502 classes with registers above 20 received paraprofessional assistance. For the schools taken as a group, then, the indications are that the objective of providing educational assistants in 60 per cent of the classes was met. Again, nine districts (Districts 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 21, 30, 31) did not reach this standard.

"Paired" vs "Single" Classes. As one would expect, varied patterns of organization in terms of "paired" and "single" classes were noted on the first grade level. These data are summarized in Table IV-4.

Class Size. A total of 1,932 classes were organized on the first grade level. Of these, 430 (22.3%) reported registers of less than 20, and were deemed to have met the goal of the program. The indications are, then, that this objective was not attained, taking the schools as a group. When the data for individual districts are examined, it appears that five districts (Districts 4, 8, 23, 24, and 30) were able to attain the stated goal.

In most instances, classes on the first grade level enrolled between 25 and 29 pupils. Of the 1,932 classes, 751 (38.9%) were of this size. An additional 370 classes, 19.2 per cent of the total, had between 20 and 24 pupils on register. Rather surprisingly, the reports from the schools listed 381 classes with registers of 30 or over; these classes constituted 19.7 per cent of the total number of first grade classes.

To what extent was the objective of class size not exceeding 27.2 met on this level? For the schools taken as a group, this goal was attained, although there was considerable variation from district to district. In twelve of the districts, average class size of those classes which enrolled 20 or more pupils exceeded the 27.2 level.

It must be remembered, in evaluating these findings, that the data deal with size of class (pupil registers) rather than with pupil-teacher ratios. As such, a far more stringent criterion has been utilized in determining the extent to which the goal of the program was attained. Had it been possible to determine the exact number of "ratio" teachers assigned to first grade classes in each school, the number of such classes meeting the twin standards of a 15 to 1 pupil-teacher ratio or of a 27.2 pupil-teacher ratio would have been much greater.

Assignment of Paraprofessionals. It is also interesting to note the data concerning the assignment of paraprofessionals to first grade classes. In all, 1209 (62.6%) of the 1,932 first grade classes received the services of an educational assistant. It should be noted, however, that 122 of these classes had pupil registers of less than 20; indeed, 28.4 per cent of these 430 small classes were accorded paraprofessional services. Again, there was considerable variation among districts; paraprofessional assignments were limited to classes with registers of 20 and over in 13 of the 29 districts participating in the program.

In general, assignments of educational assistants were made with greater frequency as class size increased. In the case of the 370 classes with class size between 20 and 24 pupils, 215 (58.1%) received paraprofessional help. Such assistance was also given to 549 (73.1%) of the 751 classes with registers of 30 and above. In all, 994 (66.2%) of the 1,502 classes with registers above 20 received paraprofessional assistance. For the schools taken as a group, then, the indications are that the objective of providing educational assistants in 60 per cent of the classes was met. Again, nine districts (Districts 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 21, 30, 31) did not reach this standard.

"Paired" vs "Single" Classes. As one would expect, varied patterns of organization in terms of "paired" and "single" classes were noted on the first grade level. These data are summarized in Table IV-4.

Table IV-4

Distribution of "Paired" and "Single" First Grade Classes
Participation in SECE Program

Dist.	No. of Classes	Number of Pupils on Register							
		Less than 20		20-24		25-29		30 or more	
		Paired	Single	Paired	Single	Paired	Single	Paired	Single
1	67	7	1	4	28		23		4
2	35		8		13		10		4
3	21	3			6		12		
4	67	16	14		9		22		6
5	86		12		27		43		4
6	81	14	2		1		38		26
7	122	10			16		58		38
8	100	48	1		6		35		10
9	127	37	4	26	7		43		10
10	10						2		8
11	4				2		2		
12	134	16	7	8	11		37		55
13	130	17	8		41		39		25
14	138	24	13		40		51		10
15	104	18	21		11		37		17
16	171				8		105		58
17	67	6		4	1		26		30
18	51		12		12		22		5
19	165	33	22	9	15		56		30
21	18		2		8		8		
23	38	13	7		7		7		4
24	15	6					7		2
27	29			6			10		13
28	30	10			2		11		7
29	41				14		20		7
30	25		11		3		6		5
31	15		2		6		7		
32	31		4		12		12		3
33	10		1		7		2		
Total	1,932	278	152	57	313	0	751	0	381

Again, it is evident that the single teacher per class is far more prevalent than the "paired" type of class organization. Of the 1,932 first grade classes for which data were available, 1,597 (82.7%), including all first grade classes with registers of 25 and over, were single teacher classes.

A total of 335 first grade classes were "paired." In 278 (83.0%) of these classes, the combined registers of the two "paired" classes did not exceed 39; in 57 (17.0%) of these classes, the combined registers were between 40 and 49. None of the combined registers of "paired" classes reached 50.

The data reported by the schools also made it possible to determine the extent to which paraprofessionals were assigned to "paired" or "single" teacher classes. Educational assistants served in 86 (25.7%) of the 335 "paired" first grade classes; 50 (18.0%) of the 278 "paired" classes with registers of below 20 and 36 (63.2%) of the 57 "paired" classes with registers of 20 or more received paraprofessional help. The rest of the paraprofessionals (1,132) all served in single teacher classes. Seventy-two (47.4%) of the 152 single teacher classes with registers below 20 were serviced by a paraprofessional; 179 (57.2%) of the 313 classes with registers between 20 and 24, 549 (73.1%) of the 751 classes with registers between 25 and 29, and 323 (84.8%) of the 381 classes with registers of 30 and over were accorded paraprofessional help.

C. Implementation on the Second Grade Level

On this level, the program called for the organization of classes with a pupil-teacher ratio of 20 in 40 per cent of all second grade classes and the maintenance of an average pupil-teacher ratio of 27.2 in the remaining 60 per cent of the class, with additional provision for educational assistant time in the latter group of classes.

Here, too, lack of definitive data concerning the assignment of "ratio" teachers made it necessary to deal with the data in terms of pupil registers rather than pupil-teacher ratios. On this level, the

objectives detailed above were considered as having been substantially met if a class size of 24 or below was reported by the school.

Table IV-5 presents a distribution of the number of second grade classes of given registers in schools participating in the program. The availability of paraprofessional help is also indicated.

Table IV-5

Distribution of Second Grade Classes Participating in SECE Program

Dist.	No. of Schools	Number of Pupils on Register							
		Less than 20		20-24		25-29		30 or more	
		Para Assigned Yes	Para Assigned No	Para Assigned Yes	Para Assigned No	Para Assigned Yes	Para Assigned No	Para Assigned Yes	Para Assigned No
1	12	1	1	10	9	10	13	6	5
2	7		2	7	6	6	12		1
3	5		2	7	4	4		1	1
4	11	2	10	19	2	30	3	7	
5	14	4	6	8	23	18	18	4	2
6	10	6	4	4	9	9	18	6	12
7	17		4	10	10	45	20	28	15
8	9		7	3	9	29	10	7	14
9	13	2	17	6	13	16	23	8	25
10	2	1				11	1		
11	1	1		3					
12	14	2	2	22	4	52	9	22	5
13	16	7	9	20	14	32	14	18	
14	19	6	13	17	19	20	36	9	9
15	16	8	3	12	24	14	22	9	3
16	22	1	1	26		96		42	
17	10	1	4	2		20	16	25	6
18	7	3	4	8	6	9	2	9	3
19	18	5	24	17	20	40	7	9	
21	3	1	3	1	5	1	2	1	3
23	5	6	11	6	3	8		1	
24	2					6	5		
27	6	1	15	2	6	11	4	1	
28	4			2	2	12	1	4	2
29	7	2		5		22	2	7	2
30	5		8	1	7		6		
31	3		2	5	3	4	2		
32	4		3	1	4	13	6	3	
33	2		1	3		1		2	1
Total	264	60	156	227	202	539	252	229	109

In all, 264 schools reported data concerning the organization of their second grade classes. In five schools, all ECE classes were non-graded; in a sixth school, second and third grade pupils were combined in a single class. The data for these six schools are not reported here.

Class Size. A total of 1,774 classes were organized on the second grade level. Of these, 216 (12.2%) reported registers of less than 20, and 429 (24.2%) reported registers between 20 and 24. Thus, a total of 645 classes, constituting 36.4 per cent of the total, can be deemed to have met the stated goal of the program. Taking the schools as a group, then, it would appear that the objective of 40 per cent of the classes with registers of 20 was approached, but not fully attained. When the data for individual districts are examined, it appears that fifteen districts (Districts 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 23, 27, 30, 31, 33) were able to attain the stated goal.

Again, it should be noted that the more stringent standard of class size or pupil register has been applied, rather than pupil-teacher ratio. In view of the fact that almost 40 per cent of the classes met the stated objective when the more rigorous criterion of class size was utilized, it is evident that more than 40 per cent would have met the standard had a criterion been set in terms of pupil-teacher ratio.

In most instances, classes on the second grade level enrolled between 25 and 29 pupils. Of the 1,774 classes, 791 (44.6%) were of this size. A total of 338 classes with registers of 30 and over were reported; these classes represented 19.1 per cent of the total number of second grade classes.

For the schools taken as a whole, the objective of an average class size of 27.2 was attained. Only six of the individual school districts (Districts 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 28) failed to attain this objective; all of these districts, however, exceeded the 27.2 level by only a fraction of a pupil.

Assignment of Paraprofessionals. The data concerning assignment of educational assistants to second grade classes is also of interest. A total of 1,055 (59.5%) of the 1,774 second grade classes received the services of a paraprofessional. The services of paraprofessionals were not limited to classes with larger registers; of the 212 classes with registers below 20, 60 (28.3%) received paraprofessional help. Such assistance was also noted in 227 (52.9%) of the 429 classes with registers between 20 and 24, in 539 (68.1%) of the 791 classes with registers between 25 and 29, and in 229 (67.8%) of the 338 classes enrolling 30 or more pupils. In all, a total of 768 (68.0%) of the 1,129 classes with registers of 25 and above received paraprofessional help. For the schools taken as a group, then, the objective of providing educational assistants in 60 per cent of the classes was met. In eleven of the individual districts (Districts 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 14, 15, 21, 24 and 30), this goal was not attained.

"Paired" and "Single" Classes. In common with the first grade finding, classes on the second grade level showed varied patterns of organization in terms of "paired" and "single" classes. The relevant data are summarized in Table IV-6.

Table IV-6

Distribution of "Paired" and "Single" Second Grade Classes
Participating in SECE Program

Dist.	No. of Classes	Number of Pupils on Register							
		Less than 20		20-24		25-29		30 or more	
		Paired	Single	Paired	Single	Paired	Single	Paired	Single
1	55		2		19		23		11
2	34		2		13		18		1
3	19	2			11		4		2
4	73		12		21		33		7
5	83	4	6		31		36		6
6	68	10		4	9		27		18
7	132	2	2		20		65		43
8	79	6	1		12		39		21
9	110	18	1	7	12		39		33
10	13		1				12		
11	6		1		3				
12	118	3	1	2	24		61		27
13	115	8	8	6	28		46		18
14	129	13	6	7	29		56		18
15	95	5	6	7	29		36		12
16	166		2		26		96		42
17	74	4	1		2		36		31
18	44	2	5		14		11		12
19	122	22	7	9	28		47		9
21	17		4		6		3		4
23	35		17		9		8		1
24	11						11		
27	40	14	2		8		15		1
28	23				4		13		6
29	40		2		5		24		9
30	22		8		8		6		
31	16		2		8		6		
32	30	2	1		5		19		3
33	8		1		3		1		3
Total	1,774	115	101	42	387	0	791	0	338

The number of classes taught by a single teacher far exceeded the number of "paired" classes on the second grade level. Of the 1,774 classes that were organized, 1,617 (91.2%) were single teacher classes.

A total of 157 second grade classes were "paired." In 115 (73.2%) of these classes, the combined registers of the two "paired" classes

did not exceed 39; in 42 (16.8%) of these classes, the combined registers were between 40 and 49. None of the combined registers of "paired" classes reached 50.

The extent to which paraprofessionals were assigned to "paired" and single teacher classes may also be determined from the data submitted by the schools. Educational assistants served in 56 (8.4%) of the 663 "paired" classes on the second grade level; 25 (11.6%) of the 216 "paired" classes with registers below 20 and 31 (6.9%) of the 447 "paired" classes with registers of 20 or more received paraprofessional help. All of the other paraprofessionals (999) served in single teacher classes. Thirty-five (38.5%) of the 91 single teacher classes with registers below 20 were accorded the services of an educational assistant; 214 (55.6%) of the 387 classes with registers between 20 and 24, 539 (68.1%) of the 791 classes with registers between 25 and 29, and 229 (67.8%) of the 338 classes with registers above 30 received paraprofessional help.

D. Conclusions

Bearing in mind that the criterion for determining extent of implementation of the SECE program (maintenance, in 40 per cent of the classes, of class registers of 15 in grade 1 and of 20 in grade 2, and of an average register of 27.2 in the remaining classes) is much more stringent than one expressed in terms of pupil-teacher ratios, what conclusions can be drawn from the data submitted by the schools?

1. The goal of assigning a paraprofessional to every kindergarten class was substantially attained.

2. The goal of establishing an average register of 15 in 40 per cent of the first grade classes in the program apparently was not attained; only five districts were able to reach this goal.

3. For the participating schools taken as a whole, the goal of establishing an average register of 27.2 in the remaining 60 per cent of the first grade classes was attained; however, twelve districts were unable to reach this goal.

4. The goal of establishing an average register of 20 in 40 per cent of the second grade classes in the program was approached, but not completely achieved; fifteen of the schools districts were, however, able to attain this objective.

5. For the participating schools taken as a whole, the objective of establishing an average register of 27.2 in the remaining 60 per cent of the second grade classes was achieved; only six of the school districts were unable to achieve this goal, and then, by only a fraction of a pupil.

Considering the stringency of the criterion used in determining extent of implementation of the program, it is evident that an extremely high degree of compliance with the directive concerning organization of the program was achieved. It must be emphasized again that, had it been possible to analyze the data submitted by the schools in terms of pupil-teacher ratios, a much greater degree of compliance would have been observed. Indeed, one may well advance the generalization, on the basis of the available data, that implementation of the program was achieved.

CHAPTER V

THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

Data regarding the implementation and effectiveness of the SECE Program on the kindergarten level was gathered through observations that were conducted in each of the 32 "core" sample schools. Specially prepared observation schedules were used in a total of 71 observations of kindergarten classes. Additional data were developed through a series of interviews with principals, assistant principals, ECE coordinators, teachers, and paraprofessionals in these schools, and through questionnaires to the same personnel in a "mail" sample of 97 schools. In addition, District ECE Supervisors were asked to complete a questionnaire.

A. OBSERVATION OF THE PROGRAM

Observations were conducted in a total of 70 kindergarten classes, approximately half in the morning and half in the afternoon. One class was observed on two separate occasions. Three of the classes that were observed were on an all-day session. Nine of the 71 observations were made in paired classes; the others in classes served by a single teacher. Paraprofessionals had been assigned to nearly every class participating in the program; in seven of the nine paired classes, two paraprofessionals were in attendance. A total of 70 paraprofessionals were observed. In six instances, student teachers were present in classes that were visited.

The observation schedule that was used in kindergarten classes directed the attention of the observer to four major areas; each of

these areas (Play Experience and Activities; Language Activities; Other Content Areas; Classroom Management) will be considered separately.

1. Play Experience and Activity

A summary of the types of play activity in which the children participated in the kindergarten classes that were observed is presented in Table V-1.

Table V-1

Types of Play Activities Observed in Kindergarten Classes

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Observed</u>		<u>Not Observed</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Domestic	46	65.7	24	34.3
Construction	52	74.2	18	25.7
Toys	44	62.8	26	37.1
Dramatic	33	47.1	37	52.9
Manipulative	54	77.1	16	22.9
Sand and Water	6	8.5	64	91.4
Rhythms	32	45.7	38	54.3
Art	53	75.7	17	24.3
Outdoor Play	13	18.5	57	81.4

The kindergarten children in the classes observed participated in many different kinds of play activities, and used a wide range of materials. Most frequently noted was the use of manipulative games, such as puzzles, pegboards, and the like, with more than three-fourths (77.1%) of the observers reporting the use of these materials. Art experiences, using clay, dough, crayons, paints, or collage were observed in 75.7 per cent of the classrooms; construction, mainly blockbuilding were reported by 74.2 per cent of the observers.

Also noted in more than three-fifths of the classes was play designed to stimulate cooperative role playing and play involving the use of toys such as cars, trucks, and trains, and domestic objects, as in a "doll corner". Rhythmic activities and dramatic play were observed in slightly less than one-half of the classes observed. The use of sand and water and outdoor play was noted relatively infrequently, although the observations were conducted during May and June.

To some degree, the nature of the play activity in which a child can engage is determined by the equipment available for his use. Table V-2 summarizes the data concerning equipment available and used in the 70 classes that were observed.

Table V-2

Play Equipment Available and in Use in Kindergarten Classes
(In Per Cents)

<u>Equipment Designed to:</u>	<u>Available</u>		<u>Not Observed</u>
	<u>In Use</u>	<u>Not In Use</u>	
Encourage quiet activities	75.7	20.0	4.3
Stimulate expression of ideas and feelings	74.2	21.5	4.3
Promote cooperative play	71.5	24.2	4.3
Encourage manipulative skill	65.7	31.4	2.9
Encourage "looking-glass self"	45.7	35.7	18.5
Stimulate large muscle activity	21.4	41.4	37.2

Equipment for all of these activities was available in a large proportion of the classrooms observed; nearly all children had an opportunity to participate in various types of play activities. The observers reported most frequently, that the children were engaged in

using manipulative materials and art materials, which are primarily designed for use by one child. Construction and role-playing activities, which are more closely related to the development of social and language skills, were also frequently noted.

a. Rating of Play Experiences. Observers used a five-point scale, ranging from Excellent (5.0) to Very Poor (1.0) to rate play experiences provided for children in the classes observed. A summary of the ratings assigned to various characteristics of the lessons observed is presented in Table V-3.

Table V-3

Ratings Assigned to Play Experiences and Activities

Distribution of Ratings (in Per Cent)

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Children participate in planning, self-selection of activities	31.4	25.7	11.4	12.9	18.6	3.4
Children free from strain; laugh and chatter	62.9	21.4	10.0	4.3	1.4	4.4
Children actively engage in satisfying activity	48.6	24.3	21.4	2.8	2.8	4.1
Play materials suitable to age level	58.6	31.4	5.7	4.3	0.0	4.4
Play materials easily accessible, in good condition	57.1	34.3	5.7	2.8	0.0	4.5
Use of available play space	44.3	27.1	12.9	12.9	2.8	4.1

Although the quality of the play experience and activities provided for the children were generally rated as good or excellent, the observers

were somewhat less enthusiastic about the children's opportunity to participate in the planning of play activities or to select these activities themselves.

2. Language Activities

Most crucial to the objectives of the SECE Program at the Kindergarten level is the development of language skills among the children; the higher the level of the oral language the children can understand and use, and the more fluently the children can express themselves, the fewer difficulties will be encountered in learning to read.

The play activities already discussed, of course, provided experiences through which children learned the use of language in communication with others; particularly those which were conducive to cooperative play and role playing. The results of the observations indicate that in almost three quarters of the classrooms (71.4%), equipment specifically designed for this type of play was in use; and in most classrooms, several different types of cooperative play activities were noted.

Specific language activities in which the children engaged were recorded by the observers. The children used language during play as well as during classroom experiences expressly designed to stimulate verbal expression and use. The language activities observed are presented in Table V-4

Table V-4

Participation by Kindergarten Children in Language Activities

<u>Activity</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Conversation	63	88.8	7	11.2
Explaining	55	77.4	15	22.6
Discussion	46	64.7	24	35.3
Asking questions	43	60.1	27	39.9
Music, rhythms	38	53.5	32	46.5
Stating needs	36	50.1	34	49.9
Giving directions	36	50.1	34	49.9
Speaking to groups	30	42.2	40	57.8
Telling stories	29	40.8	41	59.2
Greetings, farewells	29	40.8	41	59.2
Planning	28	39.3	42	60.7
Dramatization	26	36.6	44	63.4
Telling experiences	21	29.5	49	70.5
Telephoning	17	23.9	53	76.1
Retelling stories	10	14.1	60	85.9
Delivering messages	9	12.6	61	87.4
Movies	3	4.2	67	95.8
Puppet Show	2	2.8	68	97.2
Poetry	1	1.4	69	98.6
T.V.	1	1.4	69	98.6
Radio	0	0.0	70	100.0

In more than half of the kindergarten classrooms, the children were observed to participate in conversing, explaining, discussing, asking questions, stating needs, and giving directions. Somewhat less frequently noted was the use of language in specially structured activities, such as planning, story telling, dramatization, the retelling of experiences, or speaking to groups.

It is of interest to define the role of the teacher and of the paraprofessional in supervising language activity. In most situations, either the classroom teacher supervised the language activities of the children, or the children's language was expressed during unsupervised play. It was only in relatively unstructured situations in which a child conversed with or expressed a personal need to an adult ("May I leave the room"), that the paraprofessional was likely to be approached. Indeed,

one may advance the generalization that the less structured the situation in which language was used, the more likely was the paraprofessional to be involved.

A summary of the relevant data concerning supervision of language activities is presented in Table V-5.

Table V-5

Supervision of Children Engaged in Language Activities, in Per Cent

<u>Activity</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Supervised by Teacher</u>	<u>Supervised by Paraprofessional</u>	<u>Supervised by Both</u>	<u>Unsupervised</u>
Conversation	63	32.3	42.2	33.8	18.3
Explaining	55	40.8	4.2	26.7	5.6
Discussion	46	42.2	4.2	12.6	5.6
Asking questions	43	30.9	4.2	14.1	11.2
Music, rhythms	38	33.8	0.0	12.6	7.1
Stating needs	36	11.2	5.6	22.5	11.2
Giving directions	36	25.3	1.4	12.6	11.2
Speaking to groups	30	18.3	1.4	12.6	9.8
Telling stories	29	25.3	5.6	1.4	8.4
Greetings, farewells	29	16.9	0.0	16.9	7.1
Planning	28	28.1	0.0	7.1	4.2
Dramatization	26	7.1	1.4	5.6	21.1
Telling experiences	21	14.1	0.0	4.2	11.2
Telephoning	17	2.8	0.0	2.8	18.3
Retelling stories	10	11.2	1.4	1.4	0.0
Delivering messages	9	5.6	0.0	1.4	5.6
Movies	3	2.8	0.0	1.4	0.0
Puppet Show	2	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0
Poetry	1	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
T.V.	1	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Radio	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

In general, the children's language activities were more likely to occur in the absence of direct supervision, as during cooperative play, than to be supervised by the paraprofessional. In structured situations expressly designed to stimulate verbal expression, such as discussion,

story telling, and planning, the teacher was firmly in command. In only rare cases was the responsibility for overseeing the children's use of language delegated to the paraprofessional.

a. Rating of Language Experiences. Observers also rated the quality of language experiences provided to the children. A summary of the ratings assigned is presented in Table V-6.

Table V-6

<u>Characteristic Rated</u>	Ratings Assigned to Language Experiences					<u>Mean Rating</u>
	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	
Adults ask questions that stimulate discussion	38.2	32.4	17.6	7.4	4.4	3.9
Adults listen to and understand children	59.4	21.7	13.0	2.9	2.9	4.3
Adults give specific attention to language development of non-English speaking children	43.4	30.2	17.0	7.5	1.9	4.1
Adults use experiences to develop children's observation and verbalization	33.8	40.0	16.9	4.6	4.6	3.9
Child-adult communication unrestricted	52.2	19.4	23.9	1.5	3.0	4.2
Child-child communication active, vital, flowing	47.1	33.8	13.2	4.4	1.5	4.2

Again, ratings assigned tended to be "good" or "excellent." In only one instance, "child-adult communication unrestricted," were a sizable number of ratings of "fair" assigned.

3. Other Content Areas

In Kindergarten, classroom activities and experiences are intended to provide the opportunity for children to develop concepts and interests in subject matter areas such as mathematics, science, social studies, health and safety, and the arts. Although the early stages of learning and appreciation in these areas ordinarily take place through informal, unstructured, exploratory activities, it was felt that disadvantaged children, with more limited backgrounds of experience and less verbal facility, were in need of more highly structured activities, with more direction from the teacher in the development of these concepts and attitudes.

With the emphasis on specific language activities and reading readiness in the SECE kindergarten program, the opportunity for the simultaneous development of language, readiness, and concepts appears to have been neglected in some classrooms, as experiences in these areas were observed less frequently and rated less favorable than more specific language or play activities.

Table V-7 presents the frequency with which activities in these other areas were provided and the observers' ratings of the quality of the experiences observed. In general, teacher performance here was rated as "fair" to "good."

Table V-7

Ratings Assigned to Experiences in Other Content Areas

Distribution of Ratings (in Per Cent)

<u>Characteristic Rated</u>	<u>Times Observed</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Teachers build understanding of basic mathematics concepts	74	22.9	36.5	17.6	4.1	5.4	3.3
Teachers structure specific group activities to develop science concepts	43	23.3	34.9	20.9	13.9	7.0	3.5
Teachers structure experiences that focus on the environment	58	22.4	29.3	32.8	6.9	8.6	3.5
Teachers encourage good health and safety practices	65	30.8	35.4	18.5	10.8	4.6	3.8
Teachers use literature to create enthusiasm and enjoyment	57	36.8	29.9	12.3	8.8	7.0	3.9
Teachers guide children to find pleasure in music	50	28.0	50.0	10.0	4.0	8.0	3.9
Teachers use art experiences for children to explore media	51	27.5	39.2	14.8	3.9	11.8	3.7

4. Classroom Management

The management of classroom routines and procedures in kindergarten was most often rated by the observers as excellent or good; in several classrooms, however, poor ratings were assigned in this area and the mean

ratings fell slightly below the level of "good." Table V-8 presents these ratings.

Table V-8

Ratings Assigned to Classroom Management

<u>Characteristic Rated</u>	<u>Number of Ratings Assigned</u>	<u>Distribution of Ratings (in Per Cent)</u>					<u>Mean Rating</u>
		<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	
Children given responsibility for routine activities	67	44.8	22.4	17.9	6.0	8.9	3.9
Character of transitions between activities	68	36.8	38.2	13.2	4.4	7.4	3.9
Teacher flexibility	66	30.3	34.8	18.2	4.5	12.1	3.7
Positive attitudes toward sharing, responsibilities and rights for self and others are fostered	67	37.3	35.8	16.4	6.0	4.5	4.0

5. Overall Ratings

In addition to rating specific aspects of the lessons in each of the four areas considered, the observers were asked to assign an "overall" rating of the quality of the classes they had observed. A summary of these overall ratings is in Table V-9.

Table V-9

Overall Observer Ratings of Kindergarten Program

Distribution of Ratings (in Per Cent)

<u>Area</u>	<u>Number of Ratings</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Play	61	32.8	31.1	24.6	6.5	4.9	3.8
Language	64	40.6	34.4	18.7	4.7	1.6	4.1
Other Content Areas	62	21.0	37.1	22.6	9.7	4.8	3.7
Classroom Management	66	40.9	30.0	18.2	6.1	3.0	4.0
Overall Observation	67	32.8	40.3	19.4	6.0	1.5	4.0

For the most part, mean ratings assigned by the observers fell close to or at the "good" level.

B. Responses to Interviews and Questionnaires

In view of the fact that responses to questions in both the interview situation and on the questionnaire were very similar, the answers given by the teachers and other personnel have been pooled. In all, 185 teachers responded to questions; of these, 179 (96.7%) had available the services of a paraprofessional. All of the respondents were female; the average register in their classes was 26.2. Thirty-four (18.4%) of the respondents taught paired classes; 144 (77.8%) were single classroom teachers; 7 (3.8%) were cluster or ratio teachers.

The interviews and questionnaires directed to participating personnel were concerned with a wide range of kindergarten practices and their effectiveness.

1. Materials

In view of the stress upon reading improvement in the schools in the SECE Program, the teachers were asked to react to the reading readiness and/or reading materials they had used during the year. Table V-10 presents a summary of such materials used by the teachers.

Table V-10

Reading Readiness and/or Reading Materials Used in
Kindergarten Classes, as Reported by Teachers

	Teachers Reporting	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Commercial readiness materials	76	41.1
Teacher made materials	59	31.9
Audio Visual approaches	48	25.9
Games	42	22.7
Bank Street	41	22.2
Project Read	25	13.5
SRA	7	3.8
Basal readers, Workbooks	8	4.3

As one would expect, many teachers used more than one approach in their classrooms. The largest number (76 - 41.1%) reported use of a wide variety of commercially published readiness materials. Almost one-third (59 - 31.9%) of the respondents indicated that they used teacher made materials. Use of audiovisual aids and games were reported by 28.6 per cent and 22.7 per cent of the teachers, respectively. Use of Bank Street materials was noted by 41 (22.2%) of the teachers; participation in Project Read by 25 (13.5%). Very few teachers reported

specific use of individualized or small group instruction to foster reading readiness or to teach reading. Twenty teachers (10.8% of the total) said that they gave instruction in phonics or the alphabet.

a. Teacher Rating of Materials. In general, the kindergarten teachers regarded the readiness and reading materials used with favor. Altogether, a total of 303 approaches were reported by the 185 teachers; of these, 241 (79.5%) were praised. Fifty-five (18.2%) were reported without comment, and twenty-five (8.3%) were regarded negatively. The most frequent criticisms were made in regard to Project Read materials; 12 of the total of 25 negative comments toward methods and materials were directed at Project Read.

The kindergarten teachers were also asked to rate the (a) sufficiency, (b) quality, (c) variety, and (d) usefulness of the materials that they had worked with during the school year. No restriction was placed on curriculum area to which the materials related. Teacher responses are summarized in Table V-11.

Table V-11

Ratings Assigned to Materials Used by Kindergarten Teachers

	Per Cent of Teachers Assigning Ratings					No Response
	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	
Sufficiency	23.8	36.8	24.3	9.7	2.2	3.2
Quality	22.7	54.1	16.2	1.6	0.5	4.9
Variety	18.9	42.2	24.9	8.1	1.1	4.9
Usefulness	29.7	48.1	15.7	1.1	0.5	4.9

Materials used were considered by most teachers to be "good" or "very good"; however, they were rated somewhat better in terms of their

quality and usefulness than of their sufficiency and variety. In commenting about materials, the greatest amount of concern was expressed in regard to audiovisual materials and games. The majority of teachers regarded these as of high quality and usefulness, but insufficient in quantity to meet the needs of the children.

2. Effectiveness of the Program, as Reported by Teachers

In addition to rating materials used, teachers were asked to gauge the effect of the Program on the learning achievement, behavior, and reading readiness and/or reading achievement of their pupils. Their responses are summarized in Table V-12. In general, the teachers tended to rate the effect of the Program as "very good" or "good."

Table V-12

Effect of SECE Program on Pupils, As Rated by Kindergarten Teachers

Per Cent of Teachers Assigning Rating

<u>Effect on</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>No Effect</u>	<u>Negative Effect</u>	<u>No Response</u>
Learning Achievement	42.2	42.7	8.1	1.6	0.0	5.4
Behavior	27.6	41.1	9.7	17.3	0.5	3.8
Reading Readiness and/or reading achievement	47.0	38.4	5.4	5.9	0.5	0.5

The comments made by the teachers in discussing their ratings are of more than academic interest. In the area of learning achievement, the kindergarten teachers were most likely to ascribe their favorable reaction to the assistance provided by the paraprofessional, whose presence facilitated the extra attention given to the pupils in the form of individualized and small group instruction.

Regarding the behavior of pupils, teachers again attributed the program's positive effect to the presence of the paraprofessional, although the effect of the Program on the children's behavior was not rated as highly as the effect on their achievement. In general, with two adults in the classroom, more individual attention and guidance could be given to troubled or disruptive children, and difficulties could be dealt with before they mushroomed into serious problems.

Teachers also ascribed the effectiveness of the Program on reading readiness or reading achievement to the individualized and small group instruction made possible by the paraprofessional assistance. Special reading and other curriculum programs were also frequently cited as contributing to the achievement of the children.

In view of these comments concerning the role of the paraprofessional, it is of interest to consider teacher responses to a question asking them to single out the one element that contributed most to the SECE Program. Their responses are summarized in Table V-13.

Table V-13

Element Contributing Most to SECE Program, as Reported
by Kindergarten Teachers

	Teachers <u>N</u>	Reporting <u>Per Cent</u>
Reduced class size	14	7.6
Assignment of ratio teachers	8	4.3
Enthusiasm of teachers and other staff members	22	11.9
Help of paraprofessionals	109	58.9
More and better materials	21	11.4
Involvement of parents	5	2.7
No Response	6	3.2

By far the largest proportion of teachers singled out the help of the paraprofessional as the one factor contributing to the success of the program. It is surprising that the assignment of ratio teachers was selected by so small a proportion of the group. Note, too, that this difference cannot be ascribed to teacher lack of familiarity with the concept of ratio or cluster teacher. In the "typical" school, according to reports by the assistant principal, there were four kindergarten classes, each with a paraprofessional assistant. An additional teacher was generally assigned to the kindergarten level, serving as a ratio teacher.

In the present instance, 179 (96.7%) of the 185 kindergarten teachers reported that they had the services of a paraprofessional available to them. When asked to indicate the three aspects of the program in which paraprofessionals were most helpful, the teachers stressed preparation of materials (87.2%), relieving teachers of routines (74.9%), and teaching children (44.1%). The marked drop in proportion of teachers citing teaching children is of interest; other aspects were selected even less frequently: controlling behavior of children (33.3%); keeping records (31.8%); handling audiovisual materials (17.3%).

The high esteem in which teachers held the paraprofessional was supported by ratings of the instructional effectiveness of kindergarten personnel assigned by 90 assistant principals who returned questionnaires. Using a five point scale, from Excellent (5.0) to Very Poor (1.0), the assistant principals assigned the mean ratings indicated in Table V-14.

Table V-14

Instructional Effectiveness of Kindergarten Personnel
As Rated by Assistant Principals

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Number of Ratings</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Paired teachers	20	4.2
Single teachers	79	4.3
Ratio teachers	67	3.9
Paraprofessionals	85	4.1
Student teachers	31	3.9

It is of interest to note that paraprofessionals received a slightly higher rating than ratio teachers.

3. Effectiveness of the Program, as Rated by Non-Teaching Personnel

Two approaches to evaluating the effectiveness of the Program were embodied in questions directed to district and school non-teaching personnel. One question to which they were asked to respond, asked them to gauge the effectiveness of the total SECE program on a five point scale ranging from Strongly Positive to Strongly Negative. Their responses are summarized in Table V-15. A comparison with teacher responses to the same question is also provided.

Table V-15

Ratings of Effectiveness of Total SECE Program on Kindergarten Level,
in Per Cent

<u>Rated by</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Strongly Positive</u>	<u>Somewhat Positive</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Somewhat Negative</u>	<u>Strongly Negative</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Principal	106	72.6	24.5	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.9
AP	90	65.5	22.2	7.7	0.0	0.0	4.4
ECE Coord.	61	55.7	24.5	8.1	0.0	0.0	11.4
Dist ECE Sup.	15	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kg. teacher	185	49.2	36.8	66 7.0	1.1	1.1	4.9

While it is evident that all of the participating personnel tend to consider that the Program has been effective, the classroom teacher is far less positive about the values of the program than other types of personnel. Indeed, it would appear that the farther removed from the classroom situation, the more a given category of personnel is apt to view the Program in strongly positive terms.

Another approach to evaluating the effect of the program was embodied in a question directed to district and school non-teaching personnel, who were asked to rank selected aspects of the kindergarten program in order of greatest improvement. Responses are summarized in Table V-16.

Table V-16

Areas of Greatest Improvement in Kindergarten Program
as Rated by Non-Teaching Personnel

Mean Ranking Assigned by Personnel*

<u>Areas of improvement</u>	<u>District ECE Coordinator</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Assistant School ECE Principal</u>	<u>ECE Coordinator</u>
General academic progress	2.6	3.0	2.6	2.1
Social behavior	2.3	3.2	2.8	2.8
School-parent relations	2.9	3.5	3.2	3.1
Instructional techniques of teachers	3.0	3.9	3.5	3.0
Teachers' control of class	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.0
Material of instruction used	2.9	3.5	3.3	2.8
Individualization of instruction	2.0	3.0	2.8	2.1
Creative expression of children	3.4	4.2	2.8	3.3
Progress in reading	2.6	3.7	3.1	2.0

*Lowest mean ranking indicates greatest improvement

The School ECE Coordinators ranked progress in reading as the area in which the greatest improvement was shown; the other groups of non-teaching personnel did not include this area as among those showing substantial improvement. The presence of an ECE Coordinator may well have facilitated the implementation of pre-reading and reading programs on the kindergarten level in their schools, through demonstrations and distribution of appropriate materials to teachers.

In general, the greatest improvements, as perceived by the non-teaching personnel, were in the following areas: general academic progress, social behavior, and individualization of instruction.

4. Problems in Implementing the Program

A common question addressed to teaching and non-teaching personnel participating in the Program asked them to identify significant problems in organization and implementation of the program at the kindergarten level. Their responses are summarized in Table V-17.

Table V-17

Significant Problems in the Organization and Implementation of the
SECE Program on the Kindergarten Level

<u>Problem Area</u>	<u>District ECE Coordinator (N=15)</u>	<u>Principal (N=106)</u>	<u>Assistant School ECE Principal (N=90)</u>	<u>Coordinator (N=61)</u>	<u>Kindergarten Teachers (N=185)</u>
Classroom and other space	50.0	43.4	41.1	46.9	33.5
Class size	28.6	25.5	28.8	27.8	46.5
Materials, including audiovisual	21.4	14.2	17.7	11.4	32.4
Parent relations	0.0	13.2	13.3	6.5	7.6
Community relations	7.1	8.5	7.7	4.9	(a)
Staff relationships	21.4	13.2	6.6	6.5	8.1
Teacher Training (Methods)	21.4	22.6	22.2	8.1	(a)
Teacher Training (management, discipline)	14.3	13.2	16.6	4.9	(a)
Overemphasis on reading	35.7	2.8	6.6	6.5	22.7
Underemphasis on reading	7.1	7.5	1.1	4.9	4.9
Teacher turnover	21.4	15.1	14.4	9.8	(a)
Pupil mobility	21.4	50.0	46.6	34.4	31.9
Discipline of children (b)					17.3
Individualization of instruction (b)					17.3

(a) Teachers not asked to indicate problem in this area

(b) Only teachers were asked to indicate problems in this area

District ECE Supervisors, principals, assistant principals, ECE coordinators and kindergarten teachers reported somewhat different problems in the organization and implementation of the SECE Program. In general, the non-teaching personnel found that insufficient classroom and other space and pupil mobility represented the greatest concern, while teachers most frequently cited class size (another side of the coin, in some respects, to problems of space), classroom and other space, materials, and pupil mobility, in that order.

The kindergarten teachers and the District ECE supervisors considered overemphasis on reading a problem far more frequently than other personnel. Problems in parent and community relations were more often noted by school administrators than by District or School ECE Coordinators; staff relationships were more often considered problems by District ECE Supervisors and principals than by other personnel.

Problems in the area of teacher training were rarely perceived by School ECE Coordinators but nearly a quarter of the District Supervisors and School administrators indicated that these were problem areas. The experience of the latter two groups in schools in which the position of ECE coordinator had not been filled may well have accounted for these differences.

It is interesting to note that although 11.4 per cent of the kindergarten teachers felt that the element contributing most to the SECE Program was the use of more and better materials, 32.4 per cent considered materials a significant problem in the implementation of the program even though the preparation of materials was the major way in which paraprofessional aid had been used. Materials were perceived as a problem by few of the administrators and coordinators questioned.

CHAPTER VI

THE PROGRAM IN THE FIRST AND SECOND GRADES

The techniques used in collecting data concerning the implementation and effectiveness of the SECE Program on the first and second grade level paralleled those utilized on the kindergarten level. Observations were conducted in 100 first grade and 101 second grade classrooms, and a total of 240 first grade and 224 second grade teachers responded to questions presented via interviews or questionnaires. The data collected via these approaches was supplemented by information gathered through interviews and questionnaires directed to other school personnel.

A. ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM

The typical first grade organizational pattern in a given school, as reported by 90 assistant principals, consisted of seven single classroom teachers, two teachers who served as ratio or cluster teachers, and five paraprofessionals. In nearly half (40 - 44.4%) of these schools, there was at least one classroom shared by two "paired" teachers; in nine (10.0%) of these schools, all teachers on the grade were paired. In these 40 schools, the average number of paired teachers per school was 4.2.

Of the 240 first grade teachers who responded to questionnaires and interviews, 76 (31.7%) were paired, 117 (48.8%) were "single" teachers with a paraprofessional assigned to their classes; and 40 (16.7%) were "single" teachers without paraprofessional assistance. The sample also included seven ratio teachers assigned exclusively to first grade classes, all but four of these first grade teachers were female.

The typical second grade organizational pattern consisted of six single classroom teachers, two ratio or cluster teachers, and four paraprofessionals. In 32 (35.6%) of the schools for which data were reported, classroom teachers were assigned as paired teachers in a single classroom; typically, there were four such paired teachers in schools which used this device. In six (6.7%) of the schools, all teachers on the second grade level were paired.

Of the 224 second grade teachers who were interviewed or who responded to questionnaires, 49 (21.9%) were paired, 119 (53.1%) were single teachers who had paraprofessional assistance, and 46 (20.5%) were single teachers without the services of a paraprofessional. Ten of these teachers were ratio teachers assigned to second grade classes.

The proportion of "paired" teachers in these sample schools was somewhat higher than among the total group of schools participating in the SECE Program, due to the selection procedures utilized for the purpose of studying these class types more adequately.

Not surprisingly, teachers who shared their classrooms with another teacher, teachers who had been assigned the assistance of a paraprofessional and teachers who did not have this assistance responded differently to the various aspects of the Program.

Not only did the Program itself have varying impact on the teachers' attitudes in the several types of classes, but the grouping and assignment of children with different needs and abilities to different types of classes affected the teachers' perceptions. First grade children were grouped heterogeneously in only 30 per cent of the schools; second grade children were so grouped in only 16.7 per cent of the schools.

Children whose potential achievement was judged to be highest were most frequently assigned to classes with larger numbers of children and no paraprofessional; children with language, learning, or emotional problems were more often assigned to smaller classes where the services of a paraprofessional were available. This selection factor itself was the source of a great deal of variance among the teachers' responses, and prevented the evaluators from providing an error-free comparison of the different types of classes.

However, keeping in mind that the children had been assigned purposely to the different classes, a study of the effects of the Program in terms of paired, single with paraprofessional, and single without paraprofessional assignment does shed light on the dynamics of the Program in action in the schools.

1. Paired Classes

First and second grade teachers who shared their rooms with other teachers in "paired" situations, responded to a request to describe the ways in which they shared the responsibility for instruction.

In most classes, each teacher taught a reading group, and "alternated during the day at being the "lead teacher" with the other assisting or working with individuals or preparing materials for the next lesson," as described by one teacher.

Of the 76 paired teachers on the first grade, 14 (18.4%) reported that the children were grouped for mathematics; 9, or 18.4 per cent of the 49 paired second grade teachers reported mathematics groups, each with the attention of one of the teachers. One paired teacher stated, "We each have a reading group. At the beginning we had separate math

and phonics groups. Since then, we have merged and the only separation we have is for reading. Although one group is ahead of the other, we have modified the speed at which we progress in order to teach the class as a unit."

Some teachers divided the double classes into two, homogeneously grouped units, teaching mathematics, reading, phonics, and language arts separately, and merging the groups for instruction in social studies, science, music, and art. In most cases, teachers divided the responsibilities for instruction in these other areas, depending upon the teachers' strengths and interests. Some teachers took turns teaching lessons to the joint class in these areas; one teacher reported that she and her partner "take turns in writing the plan book each week - one teacher - who writes the plan for the week teaches language arts, science and music - other teacher does math, social studies, art, health and safety."

It proved to be extremely difficult to define the exact role of the ratio teacher within this structure. For example, it was not possible to determine the amount of time that the services of ratio teachers were available to paired teacher classrooms. Most classroom teachers were unable to distinguish between the ratio teachers assigned under the program and other teaching personnel assigned to "cover" their classes during "preparation" periods.

It was clear, however, that many classes taught by paired teachers did not have the services of ratio teachers. As one first grade teacher put it, "I am used for lunch duty and prep and my partner is out for prep. We are only in the class together about 2 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours per day....". A second grade teacher reported, "...by the time we covered for each other

for lunch and preparation periods, we ended up with one teacher to 40 children about half of the day, which defeated the purpose."

Few paired teachers (3 in grade 1 and 1 in grade 2) reported that they had an opportunity to plan together. Generally each teacher planned independently for her own reading group, for her own mathematics group (if such groups had been formed), and for her own "other areas of instruction." Only rarely were paired teachers permitted joint "preparation" periods; several teachers stated, as did one first grade teacher that she and her partner "have given up a few prep periods a week so that our schedule will better accommodate the division of children."

Evidently, a combination of factors - in most instances, teachers have little or no opportunity for joint planning; the joint classes are large; both teachers are present in the room for about half the day yet schedules must be met - makes the instructional program in paired classes less flexible rather than more flexible in providing suitable small group and individual instruction for the children.

Few severe "personality" problems were reported by the paired teachers; some, however, reported that the presence of two teachers of equal authority created a "diffusion of authority" which created discipline problems, or that the different approaches used by the two teachers confused the children.

Table VI-1 summarizes the responses of the teachers in regard to problems that arose as a result of sharing a room.

Table VI-1
Problems in Sharing a Room, As Reported
by Paired Teachers

<u>Problem</u>	Teachers Reporting			
	Grade 1		Grade 2	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Room size	21	27.6	14	28.5
Insufficient closet space	11	14.5	6	7.9
Too many children	25	32.9	10	20.4
Grouping	12	15.8	8	16.3
Scheduling of preparation periods	8	10.5	4	8.2
Too many distractions	6	7.9	5	10.2
Noise level	8	10.5	2	4.1
Differences between teachers	5	6.6	8	16.3
Discipline problems	7	9.2	7	14.3
Other	10	13.1	2	4.1
No problems	22	28.9	10	20.4
No response	3	3.9		

On the first grade level, approximately 60 per cent of the problems identified by the teachers centered about the related factors of "too many children" or "room size." These also constituted almost 50 per cent of the problems cited by second grade teachers. About one-sixth of the teachers on both grade levels considered grouping a problem - again, this may reflect the number of children in the room.

Some data reported by observers is of interest in this discussion of paired classes. Observers were asked to note activities of adults present in the classroom; in particular, they were asked to rank the time spent on

various activities during the period that they observed classes in action. A summary of mean ratings of time spent on various activities is presented in Table VI-2.

Table VI-2

Observers' Mean Ranking of Time Spent by Adults in Various Activities in First and Second Grade Classes (a)

	Grade 1			Grade 2		
	<u>Teacher 1</u>	<u>Teacher 2</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Teacher 1</u>	<u>Teacher 2</u>	<u>Para</u>
Teaching class	1.5	1.6	5.2	1.5	2.7	6.5
Teaching small group	2.0	1.9	1.4	1.9	1.2	1.5
Teaching individuals	3.0	2.5	1.9	3.0	2.4	1.8
Discipline	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.6	4.0	3.9
Checking work	5.7	4.5	4.2	3.9	5.4	3.6
Record keeping	3.7	4.0	2.8	5.9	3.6	2.8
Housekeeping	5.7	5.6	4.9	6.0	4.8	3.3

(a) Lowest ranking indicates greatest amount of time spent

On the first grade level, the rankings indicate that, for the most part, the paired teachers functioned in much the same way, spending approximately equal amounts of time at each type of activity. Such a pattern of rankings indicates that no pattern of dominance, in which one teacher utilized the second as an "assistant," was in evidence. Moreover, the pattern of activities of the paraprofessional differed markedly from that of the teachers; she rarely took charge of the total class group, and spent a greater portion of her time on record keeping than did the teachers. It is interesting to note, in passing, that the greatest proportion of the teachers' time was given to teaching the total class group, despite the

presence of other adults in the classroom.

A much different picture emerges on the second grade level. Here, the rankings suggest that one teacher tended to take the lead in teaching the class as a whole; the second teacher spent a greater portion of her time in teaching small groups and individuals, in record keeping, and in housekeeping than did the more dominant teacher. It would appear that school principals tend to assign a larger proportion of inexperienced teachers to second grade than to first grade classes; many of these new teachers were paired with older, experienced teachers.

B. OBSERVATION OF THE PROGRAM

1. Type of Lessons Observed

Observations were conducted in 100 first grade and 101 second grade classrooms in the 32 "core" sample schools. On the first grade level, 94 language arts and reading lessons were observed in single teacher classes and 43 in classes with paired teachers. A total of 69 paraprofessionals and 15 student teachers were present in the classrooms during these lessons. Of the 137 lessons in reading and language arts that were observed, 103 (75.2%) were characterized by the observer as reading lessons, and the remainder as language arts. The overlap between the two types of lessons was so great, however, that it was deemed advisable to consider them as a single lesson type.

First grade lessons in other subject matter areas were observed in 64 classes in the core sample schools, 22 in single classes with paraprofessionals, 24 in paired classes, and 18 in single classes without paraprofessional assistance. In seven classes, a student teacher was present during the observation. The lessons observed were mainly devoted

to instruction in mathematics; 48 (75.0%) of all other subject matter lessons were in this area. Other lessons observed included seven (10.9%) in science, four (6.3%) in social studies, two (3.1%) in music, and one (1.6%) in art. Observers were unable to categorize the subject matter emphasis in two other lessons that were observed.

On the second grade level, reading lessons were observed in 92 classes. Of these, 71 (77.2%) were classes taught by a single teacher; the remaining 21 by paired teachers. Forty-seven paraprofessionals and 4 student teachers were present in the classroom during these lessons.

Lessons in subjects other than reading were observed in 94 second grade classrooms. Of these, 47 (50.0%) were in mathematics; 33 (35.1%) in language arts; six (6.4%) in art; five (5.3%) in social studies, two (2.1%) in health, and one (1.1%) in science. Again, observers were unable to categorize two additional lessons in terms of subject matter emphasis.

a. Patterns of Organization. The observers were able to identify patterns of organization used during the lesson:

In 64 (46.7%) of the reading lessons observed on the first grade level, two groups, each supervised by an adult, were seen at work; in 54 (39.4%) of these lessons, total group instruction by a single teacher was noted. Other patterns of organization, each of which involved some independent work by children, were also noted. In 17 (12.4%) of the classes, two groups, one working with an adult and the other working independently were noted; in 20 (14.6%) of the classes, independent study by the entire class, all using the same materials was observed; in nine (6.6%) of the classes, an individualized approach, with children using varied materials and adults circulating, was the pattern noted. In

13 (9.5%) of the lessons, more than two adults, each working with a small group, was observed; the additional adults were cluster teachers or student teachers.

On the second grade level, two reading groups, each working with an adult, were seen at work in 37 (40.2%) of the classes; total group instruction in reading was noted in 31 (33.7%) of the classes. Two groups of children, one with an adult and one working independently, were seen in 21 (22.9%) of the classes. Independent study, in which all children used the same materials was observed in 19 (20.7%) of the classes; while individualized study, with the children using varied materials was noted in nine, or 9.8 per cent, of the classes. A third adult was also noted in nine classes.

The frequency with which the various patterns of organization were used in the teaching of reading were strikingly similar on both the first and second grade levels. There appeared to be a slightly greater attempt to provide for more independent study and independent group work on the second grade level.

Even less variation was noted when lessons in subject matter areas other than reading were characterized in terms of pattern. On the first grade level, 52 (81.3%) of the 64 such lessons observed were characterized as total class instruction by a single teacher, although in only 18 of these classes did a single teacher work alone. On the second grade level, 72 (76.6%) of the lessons in areas other than reading were taught in this manner. Use of two groups, each supervised by an adult, was seen in seven (10.9%) of these lessons on the first grade level and in 14 (14.9%) of the lessons on the second grade level. Independent or individualized study by children was noted in 12 (18.8%) of the lessons on the first grade and

in 18 (19.2%) of the lessons on the second grade level. Again, there is little difference between the two grade levels.

Additional insights into patterns of classroom organization may be gleaned from consideration of observer reports of the proportion of time different grouping patterns were in evidence during the period that they observed classes in action. These data are presented in Table VI-3.

Table VI-3

Grouping Patterns Used in Grades 1 and 2, as Reported by Observers

<u>Grouping Pattern</u>	<u>Per cent of Time Pattern was Observed</u>					
	<u>0-19%</u>	<u>20-39%</u>	<u>40-59%</u>	<u>60-79%</u>	<u>80-99%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>Grade 1</u>						
Total class group	15.3	22.4	28.6	8.2	7.1	18.4
Small groups	52.1	17.3	12.2	10.2	2.0	6.1
Individual	82.7	15.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Combinations of small groups and individuals	65.3	12.2	10.2	9.2	1.0	2.0
<u>Grade 2</u>						
Total class group	19.8	23.7	33.6	4.9	6.9	10.9
Small groups	62.4	7.9	18.8	6.9	1.9	2.9
Individuals	80.2	11.9	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combinations of small groups and individuals	59.4	6.9	3.9	10.9	4.9	3.9

On the first grade level, children were taught as a total class group more than 40 per cent of the time in 62.3 per cent of the classrooms; the comparable figure on the second grade level was 55.4 per cent. Instruction directed to individuals or small groups, or to combination of the two, comprised a relatively small proportion of class time.

It might be emphasized, at this point, that teachers were requested to present reading lessons for the purpose of these observations; although the reading lessons were most frequently taught in small groups, the actual amount of time that children were grouped for instruction was small.

Although teachers and paraprofessionals reported that the presence of an additional teacher in a "paired" classroom and the paraprofessional in single teacher classroom made the greatest impact on the learning achievement, behavior, and reading achievement of the children by making it possible to group the children for instruction, and to provide individualized instruction, these instructional patterns were not observed to be implemented during major portions of the class time. It seems most likely, in most cases, that the extra adults were used as "trouble shooters," preventing disruption and interruption of the main, total class lesson.

2. Observer Ratings of Teacher Performance

Observers rated various aspects of the lessons they observed in reading and other areas on a scale ranging from Excellent (5.0) to Very Poor (1.0). Mean ratings assigned to first and second grade teachers are summarized in Table VI-4.

Table VI-4

Mean Ratings Assigned to Various Characteristics of Lessons
Observed in First and Second Grade Classes

	Mean Rating			
	Grade 1 <u>Reading</u>	<u>Other</u>	Grade 2 <u>Reading</u>	<u>Other</u>
Lesson is well planned and organized	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.6
Lesson type and level of content suitable for children in class	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.8
Lesson is paced to the needs and the personality of the children	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.4
Teacher evaluates and encourages children to evaluate learnings	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.4
Emphasis of lesson is on the development of concepts and understanding rather than drill and memorization	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.6
Experiences of children are drawn upon	3.5	2.8	3.1	2.8
Provision is made for follow-up based on needs and interests of the children	3.1	2.9	3.1	2.8
Teacher uses opportunities to relate concepts and learnings to other areas of curriculum	3.0	2.7	2.8	2.7
Children are aware of what they are learning	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.6
Teacher talks clearly and at a suitable volume	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.0
Teacher encourages thinking and oral language through use of stimulating questions	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.3

(Continued)

	Grade 1		Grade 2	
	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Other</u>
Teacher uses praise and encouragement; avoids reproof as much as possible	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8
Many children participate, comment, explain, ask questions, discuss, demonstrate	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.4
Teacher uses good techniques for involving slower as well as faster learners	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.0
Most children are alert, interested, eager, and not tense during instruction	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.5
Children appear to have learned what teacher aimed to teach	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.0
Materials used during lesson are suitable in content and level of difficulty	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.7
When total class is not taught as a total group, activities provided for other children are suitable and worthwhile	4.0	4.3	3.8	3.8
Materials used by independent groups are suitable in content and level of difficulty	3.8	4.4	3.9	3.9
Independent groups or individuals work consistently at assigned or other tasks	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.6
Work done by independent groups or individuals is checked and supervised in some way	3.8	4.0	3.4	3.7
General estimate of teacher's instructional ability, based on this lesson	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.4
General estimate of teacher's control of class during lesson	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.8
General estimate of teacher's use of paraprofessional during lesson	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.4

Ratings in regard to the various aspects of a lesson were, in general, "fair" to "good." In almost all instances, ratings assigned to lessons given in first grade classrooms were more favorable than those given on the second grade level. Lessons in reading were generally more highly rated in most areas than lessons in other subject areas. The least successful aspects of the lessons observed regarded the relating of the lesson itself to the past and future experiences of the children, by drawing upon their past experiences and by providing follow-up based on their needs and interests, and in relating of the concepts and learnings involved in the lesson to other areas of the curriculum.

These lower ratings point to a lack of sequential, structured experiences in subject matter areas, and the isolation of one area of knowledge from another, both within and between subject areas. This fragmentation of the children's learning experiences was noted by the observers in the kindergarten program as well, and point to a serious defect in the Program; emphasis may be placed on the mechanics of reading at the expense of other areas of learning.

The rarity with which lessons other than reading, language arts, or mathematics were presented in the presence of the observers, and the frequency with which teachers specifically complained about the insufficiency of materials in subject matter areas also point to the general conclusion, that school subject other than reading and language arts instruction have been somewhat neglected, and that opportunities to develop language and comprehension through an integration and enrichment of the child's various experiences and learnings in school and elsewhere have been minimized.

a. Overall Rating. Observers, in addition to rating the lessons they observed, appraised each classroom visited in regard to the general relationships between adults and children, classroom climate, and use of the physical plant. The means of these ratings are presented in Table VI-5; the scale employed was always=5, usually=4, occasionally=2, seldom or never=1.

Table VI-5

Mean Ratings Assigned to Various Characteristics of Classes
Observed in Grades 1 and 2

<u>Characteristic</u>	Mean Ratings - Overall Appraisal	
	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
Relationships between children are friendly, cooperative	4.2	4.0
Children communicate freely with little yelling, pushing, interrupting	3.9	3.7
Children show independence and help one another in dressing, working	3.4	3.8
Children tend to use sentences rather than words or phrases in communicating	3.1	3.3
Children appear to like school; general atmosphere of class free from tension	4.0	3.9
Children are courteous to teachers and other adults	4.1	4.1
Children show confidence in teacher and other adults, ask for help when needed; are not unduly demanding	4.4	3.9

(Continued)

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
Children accept directions of adults promptly, without hostility	4.0	4.0
Teacher avoids over-domination; children given opportunities for initiative or leadership	3.2	3.1
Relationship between teachers sharing room is positive	4.4	4.2
Relationship between teacher and paraprofessional is friendly, cooperative, confident	4.4	4.3
Emotional climate of classroom is warm and positive	3.9	3.8
Quiet learning activities are interspersed with play, body activity or rest	3.0	3.3
Grouping patterns vary with different activities	3.4	3.7
Attention is given to learning of individual children as well as total class and small groups	3.7	3.7
Classroom routines and management by teacher are well developed and effective	4.0	3.9
Paraprofessional actively participates in children's functioning and learning activities	3.8	4.1
Room is attractively furnished and decorated, not cluttered	4.1	3.8
Furniture is suitable to children; functionally arranged	4.3	3.7
Classroom space is well utilized	4.2	3.7
Toilet and washing facilities are easily accessible	4.3	4.1

(Continued)

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
Exit to street is easily accessible	4.3	4.2
Safety precautions appear to be well observed both in physical facilities and class management	4.3	4.0

The overall appraisals made by the observers in regard to various characteristics of the classrooms observed reveal, in general, that positive interpersonal relationships between children, between children and adults, and between adults themselves were "usually" observed; positive instances of classroom characteristics which relate more directly to the children's work itself were less frequently observed.

These overall ratings, of course, tell only part of the story - differences in ratings assigned to classes taught by paired teachers (P), single teachers with paraprofessionals (SP), and single teachers without paraprofessionals (SNP), will be considered below. Tables VI-6 and VI-7 present the observers' ratings for the three types of classes in grade 1 and grade 2, respectively. Only 20 characteristics were considered in this analysis; three of the items were not applicable.

Table VI-6

Observers' Ratings of Classes Taught by Paired Teachers,
Single Teachers with Paraprofessionals and Single Teachers
Without Paraprofessionals (in Per Cent)

Grade 1

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Type of Class</u>	<u>Ratings</u>				Number of Ratings
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom or Never</u>	
Relations between children are friendly and cooperative	P	41.4	27.6	27.6	3.4	29
	SP	44.2	32.6	16.3	7.0	43
	SNP	34.1	51.2	14.6	0.0	41
Children communicate freely with little yelling, pushing, interrupting	P	34.5	24.1	24.1	17.2	29
	SP	34.9	39.5	11.6	14.0	43
	SNP	22.0	46.3	26.8	4.9	41
Children show independence and help one another in dressing, working	P	16.0	32.0	16.0	36.0	25
	SP	20.0	25.0	37.5	17.5	40
	SNP	10.3	38.5	38.5	12.8	39
Children tend to use sentences rather than words or phrases in communicating	P	7.1	28.6	39.3	25.0	28
	SP	7.0	27.9	30.2	34.9	43
	SNP	9.8	24.4	44.0	22.0	41
Children appear to like school, general atmosphere of class free from tension	P	37.9	34.5	20.7	6.9	29
	SP	34.9	39.5	16.3	9.3	43
	SNP	24.4	51.2	24.4	0.0	41
Children are friendly and courteous to teacher and other adults	P	34.5	37.9	24.1	3.4	29
	SP	39.5	41.9	14.0	4.7	43
	SNP	31.7	46.3	22.0	0.0	41
Children show confidence in teacher and other adults; ask for help when needed; are not unduly demanding	P	37.9	27.6	20.7	13.8	29
	SP	39.5	32.5	18.6	9.3	43
	SNP	24.4	46.3	19.5	9.8	41

(Continued)

<u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Ratings</u>				<u>Number of Ratings</u>
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom or Never</u>	
Children accept directions of adults promptly without hostility	P	31.0	37.9	20.6	10.3	29
	SP	37.2	39.5	18.6	4.7	43
	SNP	19.5	58.5	17.0	4.9	41
Teacher avoids overdomination; children given opportunity for initiative or leadership	P	18.5	18.5	25.9	37.0	27
	SP	18.6	27.9	30.2	23.3	43
	SNP	15.0	27.5	32.5	25.0	40
Emotional climate of classroom is warm and positive	P	35.7	28.6	17.9	17.9	28
	SP	32.6	39.5	18.6	9.3	43
	SNP	32.5	40.0	17.5	10.0	40
Quiet learning activities are interspersed with play, body activity or rest	P	34.6	19.2	23.1	23.1	26
	SP	28.2	20.5	25.6	25.6	39
	SNP	22.2	36.1	22.2	19.4	36
Grouping patterns vary with different activities	P	37.5	12.5	29.2	20.1	24
	SP	21.0	26.3	23.9	23.7	38
	SNP	30.5	30.5	13.9	25.0	36
Attention is given to learning of individual children as well as total class and small groups	P	32.1	28.6	25.0	14.3	28
	SP	25.6	34.9	23.3	16.3	43
	SNP	24.4	39.0	24.4	12.2	41
Classroom routines and management by teacher are well developed and effective	P	32.1	35.7	28.6	3.6	28
	SP	41.9	25.6	20.9	11.6	43
	SNP	37.7	39.0	17.1	12.2	41
Room is attractively furnished and decorated, not cluttered	P	31.0	37.9	31.0	0.0	29
	SP	51.2	23.3	23.2	2.3	43
	SNP	17.5	50.0	27.5	5.0	40
Furniture is suitable to children; functionally arranged	P	44.8	44.8	10.3	0.0	29
	SP	53.5	30.2	9.3	7.0	43
	SNP	34.1	48.9	14.6	2.4	41

(Continued)

<u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Ratings</u>				Number of Ratings
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom or Never</u>	
Classroom space is well utilized	P	44.8	41.4	10.3	3.4	29
	SP	42.9	31.0	21.4	4.8	42
	SNP	34.1	39.0	22.0	4.9	41
Toilet and washing facilities are easily accessible	P	37.9	41.4	20.7	0.0	29
	SP	47.6	38.1	14.3	0.0	42
	SNP	45.0	37.5	15.0	2.5	40
Exit to the street is easily accessible	P	44.8	31.0	20.7	3.4	29
	SP	58.1	23.3	14.0	4.6	43
	SNP	36.6	51.2	12.2	0.0	41
Safety precautions appear to be well observed both in physical facilities and class management	P	44.4	37.1	18.5	0.0	27
	SP	57.1	31.0	11.9	0.0	42
	SNP	36.6	43.9	17.1	2.4	41

Table VI-7

Observers' Ratings of Classes Taught by Paired Teachers,
Single Teachers with Paraprofessionals and Single Teachers
Without Paraprofessionals (in Per Cent)

Grade 2

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Type of Class</u>	<u>Ratings</u>				Number of Ratings
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom or Never</u>	
Relationships between children are friendly, cooperative	P	20.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	20
	SP	36.8	39.5	23.7	0.0	38
	SNP	27.3	48.5	18.2	6.1	33
Children communi- cated freely with little yelling, pushing, interrupting	P	10.0	55.0	25.0	10.0	20
	SP	42.8	35.7	42.8	10.7	38
	SNP	24.2	33.3	24.2	18.2	33
Children show inde- pendence and help one another in dressing, working	P	5.3	36.8	42.1	15.8	19
	SP	10.0	33.3	36.7	20.0	30
	SNP	10.7	25.0	39.3	25.0	28

(Continued)

<u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Ratings</u>				<u>Number of</u> <u>Ratings</u>
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom or Never</u>	
Children tend to use sentences rather than words or phrases in communicating	P SP SNP	15.2 23.7 5.0	27.3 47.4 45.0	39.4 18.4 40.0	18.2 10.5 10.0	33 38 20
Children appear to like school; general atmosphere of class free from tension	P SP SNP	5.0 23.7 33.3	65.0 47.4 30.3	30.0 18.4 33.3	0.0 10.5 3.0	20 38 33
Children are courteous to teacher and other adults	P SP SNP	15.0 31.6 45.4	60.0 44.7 42.4	25.0 21.0 9.1	0.0 2.6 3.0	20 38 33
Children show confidence in teacher and other adults, ask for help when needed; are not unduly demanding	P SP SNP	20.0 26.3 25.0	55.0 39.5 50.0	20.0 28.9 21.9	5.0 5.3 3.1	20 38 32
Children accept directions of adults promptly, without hostility	P SP SNP	18.2 31.6 30.3	50.0 42.1 48.5	9.1 21.0 15.1	22.7 5.3 6.1	22 38 33
Teacher avoids overdomination; children given opportunities for initiative or leadership	P SP SNP	5.3 21.6 9.4	21.0 18.9 28.1	52.6 27.0 37.5	21.0 32.4 25.0	19 37 32
Emotional climate of classroom is warm and positive	P SP SNP	5.0 24.3 27.3	65.0 48.6 36.4	15.0 27.0 21.2	15.0 0.0 15.2	20 37 33
Quiet learning activities are interspersed with play, body activity or rest	P SP SNP	11.1 20.6 9.4	44.4 32.3 25.0	22.2 32.3 43.7	22.2 14.7 21.9	18 34 32

(Continued)

<u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Ratings</u>				<u>Number of Ratings</u>
		<u>Always</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom or Never</u>	
Grouping patterns	P	31.6	36.8	21.0	10.5	19
vary with	SP	31.2	40.6	18.7	9.4	32
different	SNP	14.3	32.1	28.6	25.0	28
activities						
Attention is given						
to learning of	P	9.5	52.4	28.6	4.8	21
individual chil-	SP	22.2	41.7	27.8	8.3	36
dren as well as	SNP	16.1	45.2	35.5	3.2	31
total class and						
small groups						
Classroom routines						
and management	P	15.0	55.0	10.0	20.0	20
by teacher are	SP	37.8	40.5	13.5	8.1	37
well developed	SNP	25.8	41.9	25.8	6.4	31
and effective						
Room is attractively	P	5.0	45.0	40.0	10.0	20
furnished and	SP	36.8	34.2	18.4	10.5	38
decorated, not	SNP	21.2	45.4	21.2	12.1	33
cluttered						
Furniture is						
suitable to	P	30.0	25.0	30.0	15.0	20
children;	SP	18.4	36.8	36.8	7.9	38
functionally	SNP	21.2	51.5	18.2	9.1	33
arranged						
Classroom space is	P	25.0	20.0	30.0	25.0	20
well utilized	SP	18.9	37.8	35.1	8.1	37
	SNP	21.2	48.5	27.3	3.0	30
Toilet and washing	P	7.7	0.0	0.0	92.3	13
facilities are	SP	0.0	0.0	8.7	91.3	23
easily accessible	SNP	4.3	4.3	4.3	86.9	23
Exit to street is	P	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	11
easily accessible	SP	0.0	0.0	6.7	93.3	30
	SNP	34.3	37.5	21.9	6.2	32
Safety precautions						
appear to be well	P	35.0	35.0	15.0	15.0	20
observed both in	SP	43.2	32.4	24.3	0.0	37
physical facili-	SNP	33.3	46.7	20.0	6.7	30
ties and class						
management						

The data was analyzed by a Chi Square technique to determine if any statistically significant differences occurred among the organizational arrangements on the characteristics that were rated. In addition, the data was further scrutinized to determine the presence of any general trend in the observers' ratings.

On the first grade level, statistical significance was attained among the classes on only one characteristic that was rated, with the SP classes obtaining the highest proportion of superior ratings. This difference involved whether the "room is attractively furnished and decorated" (SP 51.2 per cent, P 31.0 per cent, SNP 17.5 per cent).

Despite the lack of statistically significant differences, a consistent direction of the ratings was readily apparent. On all except one characteristic (whether children use sentences in communicating) the SNP classes received the smallest proportion of superior ratings. Comparing the observers' ratings of the P and the SP classes, it was found that the SP classes received a higher proportion of superior ratings more than twice as often as the P classes.

On the second grade level, statistically significant differences were found among four characteristics: children's use of sentences, children's attitude toward school, the emotional climate of the classroom, and whether classroom space was well utilized. In three of these four characteristics, statistical significance was generated by the extremely high proportion of unfavorable ratings received by the P classes.

Although not very many characteristics on which the second grade classes were rated showed significant differences, it is interesting to note that three of the four significant differences presented the

P classes in an unfavorable light. As on the first grade level, the general direction of the observers' ratings again favored the SP classes. On the second grade level the SP classes received a higher proportion of superior ratings eleven times as compared to four times for the P classes, and five times for the SNP classes.

2. Materials

The observers were asked to rate the quality and variety of materials available to the first and second grade teachers. A summary of their ratings is presented in Table VI-8.

Table VI-8

Observer Ratings of Materials Available in First and Second Grade Classes, in Per Cent

<u>Area</u>	Observer Rating		
	<u>Plentiful, Varied</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Sparse, or Not Observed</u>
<u>First Grade</u>			
Library, recreational reading	28.0	63.0	7.0
Reading workbooks	27.0	58.0	13.0
Readers and other skills material	33.0	55.0	10.0
Other language arts	24.0	47.0	27.0
Science	18.0	44.0	36.0
Mathematics	21.0	48.0	29.0
Art	20.0	51.0	27.0
Music	7.0	38.0	53.0
Physical activities	5.0	13.0	80.0

(Continued)

<u>Second Grade</u>	<u>Plentiful, Varied</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Sparse, or Not Observed</u>
Library, recreational reading	39.6	47.5	12.8
Reading workbooks	27.7	61.3	10.9
Readers and other skills materials	31.6	58.4	9.9
Other language arts	16.8	61.3	21.7
Science	9.9	46.5	43.5
Mathematics	14.8	58.4	26.7
Art	16.8	51.4	31.6
Music	6.9	28.7	64.4
Physical activities	3.9	16.8	79.2

In general, materials for reading, language arts, and art were judged to be at least adequate in seventy per cent or more of the first and second classes; materials in other areas were less frequently observed and less often rated as "plentiful and varied." The paucity of material seems to have been a problem on the second grade level (see below).

3. Activities of Children

Observers were asked to note the activities in which the children engaged during the course of the period of observation of the class. Those activities which lasted five minutes or more and involved more than five children, were to be recorded. A summary of the observers notations is presented in Table VI-9.

Table VI-9

Activities Observed in First and Second Grade Classrooms,
by Per Cent of Classrooms

<u>Activity</u>	<u>First Grade</u>	<u>Second Grade</u>
Language development	88.0	84.1
Discussion	61.0	63.3
"Drill"	57.0	66.3
Demonstration by child	31.0	38.6
Play	27.0	17.8
Rest	25.0	25.7
Music	23.0	13.8
Planning	22.0	27.7
Teacher reading aloud	19.0	11.8
Storytelling	18.0	10.9
Art	13.0	13.8
Physical education	12.0	18.8
Dancing	12.0	3.9
Recreational reading	12.0	21.7
Research		10.9
Experimentation		5.9

On both the first and second grade levels, most of the classroom activities engaging groups for any length of time were involved with some aspect of language development, although a wide variety of other activities were observed. The very large stress upon "drill" is of interest.

It would appear that teachers were very resourceful in introducing activities, even when they had very little in the way of adequate

materials with which to work. Evidently, they made very good use of what they had, or obtained what they needed for specific purposes from a variety of extra-school sources.

C. RESPONSES TO INTERVIEWS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

On the first and second grade levels, as on the kindergarten level, responses to questions obtained via interviews and questionnaires were pooled. Responses were obtained from 240 first grade teachers and 224 second grade teachers to the same questions asked of kindergarten teachers.

1. Materials

Teachers in both first and second grade were asked to indicate the reading materials they had used during the course of the year. A summary of their responses is given in Table VI-10.

Table VI-10

Reading Readiness and/or Reading Materials Used in First and Second Grade Classes, as Reported by Teachers

<u>Material Used</u>	<u>First Grade</u>		<u>Second Grade</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Basal Readers	70	29.2	87	38.9
Bank Street	90	37.5	70	31.3
Project Read	25	10.4	27	12.1
SRA	15	6.3	26	11.6
Trade books and other commercially prepared Material	100	41.7	76	33.9
Teacher-made Materials	56	23.3	47	21.0
Workbooks	25	10.4	23	10.3
Weekly Reader	23	9.6	24	10.7
Audiovisual Materials	42	17.5	39	17.4

Most teachers indicated that they used two or more approaches in their classes. Basal readers were used more frequently in second grade than in first grade; the reverse was true of trade books and other commercially prepared materials. A smaller proportion of teachers on these grade levels reported using teacher-made materials than was noted on the kindergarten level.

Few teachers reported use of individualized or small group instruction to foster reading growth. Thirty-one first grade teachers, 12.9 per cent of the total, noted use of individualized or small group instruction, 30 (12.5%) reported use of phonetic approach. On the second grade level, individualized instruction was reported by 27 (12.1%) of the teachers, small group instruction by 26 (11.6%), and a phonetic approach by 12 (5.4%).

Teachers were also asked to rate the adequacy of the materials with which they had worked during the year with regard to sufficiency, quality, variety, and usefulness. Their responses are summarized in Table VI-11.

Table VI-11

Ratings Assigned to Materials Used by First and
Second Grade Teachers

Per Cent of Teachers Assigning Ratings						
	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
<u>First Grade</u>						
Sufficiency	22.5	36.7	23.8	10.0	3.8	3.3
Quality	24.2	52.5	17.9	0.8	1.3	3.3
Variety	20.4	37.1	28.8	8.3	1.7	3.8
Usefulness	30.4	45.0	17.1	1.7	0.8	5.0
<u>Second Grade</u>						
Sufficiency	19.6	40.6	25.9	7.6	4.5	1.8
Quality	16.1	58.5	22.3	0.9	1.8	0.4
Variety	17.9	36.6	33.9	9.8	1.3	0.4
Usefulness	19.2	51.3	24.6	2.7	0.9	1.3

In general, the ratings assigned to materials by the first grade teachers paralleled those made by the kindergarten teachers; the distribution of responses was virtually identical. Teachers on the kindergarten and first grade levels generally considered the materials available to them as "good" or "very good" in the four characteristics rated. On the second grade level, however, ratings tended to fall into the "fair" and "good" categories. Fewer than 20 per cent of the second grade teachers used the "very good" category to designate the adequacy of materials in any of the four characteristics.

Comments made by teachers concerning materials are of interest. Approximately fifteen per cent of the first and second grade teachers indicated that they needed more audiovisual materials and more

manipulative games. Materials for use in the mathematics program were also considered in short supply.

2. Effectiveness of the Program, as Reported by Teachers

The teachers were asked to estimate the effect of the Program on the learning achievement, behavior, and reading readiness and/or reading achievement of their pupils; responses are summarized in Table VI-12.

Table VI-12

Effect of SECE Program on Pupils, As Rated by First and
Second Grade Teachers

		Per Cent of Teachers Assigning Rating					
<u>Effect on</u>	<u>Type of Class Assignment(a)</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>No Effect</u>	<u>Negative Effect</u>	<u>No Response</u>
<u>First Grade</u>							
Learning Achievement	P(76)	31.6	36.8	15.8	6.6	2.6	6.6
	SP(117)	25.6	41.0	17.0	11.1	0.0	5.1
	SNP(40)	17.5	35.0	17.5	20.0	0.0	10.0
	Total(240)*	26.3	38.8	16.7	11.3	0.8	6.7
Behavior	P(76)	19.7	35.5	21.1	13.2	5.3	5.3
	SP(117)	25.0	34.2	14.5	28.2	3.4	3.4
	SNP(40)	12.5	30.0	10.0	27.5	5.0	15.0
	Total(240)*	17.1	34.2	15.4	22.9	4.6	5.8
Reading	P(76)	26.3	43.4	17.1	7.9	0.0	5.3
	SP(117)	31.6	38.5	12.0	12.8	0.0	5.1
	SNP(40)	20.0	32.5	15.0	12.5	0.0	20.0
	Total(240)*	28.3	38.8	13.8	11.7	0.0	7.5
<u>Second Grade</u>							
Learning Achievement	P(49)	42.9	28.6	6.1	12.2	0.0	10.2
	SP(119)	23.5	37.8	28.6	5.9	0.8	9.2
	SNP(46)	10.9	41.3	19.6	15.2	2.2	10.9
	Total(224)**	25.9	34.8	21.0	10.7	0.9	6.7
Behavior	P(49)	12.2	44.9	22.4	12.2	0.0	8.2
	SP(119)	9.2	37.8	21.8	25.2	3.4	2.5
	SNP(46)	13.1	32.6	19.6	17.4	4.3	13.1
	Total(224)**	11.6	37.1	20.5	21.9	2.7	6.3
Reading	P(49)	34.7	38.8	10.2	8.2	0.0	8.2
	SP(119)	26.1	41.2	20.2	6.7	1.7	4.2
	SNP(46)	19.6	45.7	10.9	13.0	0.0	10.9
	Total(224)**	27.2	39.7	16.1	9.4	0.9	7.7

(a) P indicates paired teachers
 SP indicates single teacher with paraprofessional
 SNP indicates single teacher, no paraprofessional assigned

* Includes responses of six ratio teachers

** Includes responses of ten ratio teachers

The teachers most frequently characterized the Program's effect as good in each of these areas; however, their ratings of effect of the Program on behavior were much less favorable than those assigned in other areas. Indeed, approximately 40 per cent of the respondents indicated that the Program had only a slight effect, no effect, or a negative effect on pupil behavior.

On both grade levels, too, single teachers with no paraprofessionals assigned to their classes were less enthusiastic than their colleagues about the effects of the Program. This was particularly true on the first grade level. On the second grade level, the responses of the paired teachers were the most favorable.

The comments made by teachers in discussing their ratings are revealing. The positive effects of the Program on the behavior of the children were generally ascribed to the presence of another adult, thus making it possible to give more individual attention and guidance to troubled children without disrupting the activities of the rest of the class. In classes with paraprofessional assistance, comments such as these were common: "more individual attention can be given to children with academic and/or emotional problems;" "the paraprofessional provides many opportunities for achieving success;" "the paraprofessional provides a greater sense of emotional security." In classes where teachers were paired, the comments had a somewhat different flavor: "both teachers can be disciplinarians;" "it is easier to handle disruptive children;" "the extra eyes on the class helps;" or "the second teacher can isolate and work with a child who is a behavior problem because he cannot keep up with a lesson." While it is unwise to stress this difference in

response unduly, the presence of the paraprofessional may, as suggested by these responses, have had a positive effect on the attitudes of teachers toward the acting-out child.

The effect of the Program on the learning achievement of the children was, again, ascribed to the individualized and small group instruction facilitated by the extra teacher or paraprofessional on hand, and to the individual attention that the extra adult was able to give to children needing remedial help. It should be noted, however, that few teachers looked upon this extra help in terms of its effect on the individual child; rather, they were more likely to note the advantage to the total class group, in terms of facility for the group to proceed under their tutelage without disruption.

On the first grade level, where teachers referred to factors other than the assistance of an extra adult in fostering learning achievement, the factor most frequently mentioned was the differential effect of the SECE Program on children who had previously had, or had not had, kindergarten experience. It was in this regard that teachers often referred to "street children," noting that these children were not able to keep up with the others and were therefore more likely to become discipline problems.

With regard to reading readiness or achievement, comments regarding the services of paraprofessionals dominated in the responses of those teachers to whom such assistance had been afforded. In many classes, paraprofessionals assumed responsibility for a small reading group, including day-to-day planning and evaluation of pupil progress, under the direction of the teacher. In others, the paraprofessional

was able to undertake a great deal of individual remedial instruction. Paired teachers were generally unable to organize such instruction; the number of children in a given room was much too large, paired teachers were generally assigned different lunch and "prep" periods, had little time for joint planning, and they were alone in the classroom for virtually half the day.

Here, too, it is of interest to consider teacher responses to a question asking them to identify the one element that contributed most to the total effectiveness of the SECE Program. Responses are summarized in Table VI-13.

Table VI-13

Element Contributing Most to SECE Program, as Reported by
First and Second Grade Teachers

		Per Cent of Teachers Responding			
<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Element</u>	<u>Paired</u>	<u>Single Para.</u>	<u>Single No Para.</u>	<u>Total*</u>
	Reduced class size	14.4	10.2	25.0	16.3
	Assignment of ratio teachers	18.4**	5.1	37.5	10.8
	Enthusiasm of teachers and other staff members	25.0	7.6	12.5	12.1
	Help of paraprofessionals	7.8	64.9	10.0	36.7
	More and better materials	11.8	4.2	12.5	7.9
	Involvement of parents	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.8
	No Response	22.3	5.1	12.5	15.4

(Continued)

<u>Grade 2</u>	<u>Element</u>	<u>Paired</u>	<u>Single Para.</u>	<u>Single No Para.</u>	<u>Total*</u>
	Reduced class size	18.4	15.1	28.3	18.8
	Assignment of ratio teachers	30.6**	8.4	17.4	15.6
	Enthusiasm of teachers and other staff members	8.2	6.8	15.2	8.5
	Help of paraprofessionals	2.0	56.3	8.7	33.0
	More and better materials	8.2	6.8	4.3	6.3
	Involvement of parents	4.1	5.0	2.2	4.0
	No Response	28.6	1.7	23.9	13.8

* Includes the responses of seven ratio teachers on the first grade level and ten ratio teachers on the second grade level

** "Paired" teachers were referred to as "ratio" teachers in some schools

The teachers' responses regarding the element making the greatest contribution to the Program differed in terms of class organization. Teachers who had been afforded paraprofessional assistance overwhelmingly considered the help given by paraprofessionals to be the most important factor; paired teachers and teachers without paraprofessional help referred to reduced class size, assignment of ratio teachers, and teacher enthusiasm as important factors. It is significant, too, that the proportion of non-response was very much higher in these two groups of teachers.

On the first grade level, 139 (57.9%) of the 240 teachers had been assigned some paraprofessional help; mean paraprofessional service of 19.5 hours per week was reported. The teachers were asked to indicate three ways in which the paraprofessionals had been most helpful. The

proportion of teachers citing specific aspects of service was as follows: relieving teacher of routines - 65.5 per cent; teaching children - 58.3 per cent; preparing materials - 56.1 per cent; controlling behavior - 35.3 per cent; keeping records - 26.6 per cent; handling audiovisual materials - 13.7 per cent.

On the second grade level, paraprofessionals had been assigned in 137 (61.2%) of the classes; these paraprofessionals gave an average of 19.6 hours per week of service to the teacher. The specific areas of service cited by the second grade teachers in discussing help given by paraprofessionals was as follows: teaching children, reported by 68.6 per cent of the teachers; relieving teacher of routines - 62.0 per cent; preparing materials - 53.3 per cent; keeping records - 40.1 per cent; controlling behavior - 27.7 per cent; and handling audiovisual materials - 10.9 per cent. The role of the paraprofessional was apparently much the same on the two grade levels.

On these levels, too, the assistant principals who rated the instructional effectiveness of personnel tended to confirm the judgments of teachers concerning the effectiveness of paraprofessionals. In general, there was little difference in the mean ratings assigned to paraprofessionals, paired teachers, and ratio teachers. The single teacher was rated more highly than any other type (Table VI-14).

Table VI-14

Instructional Effectiveness of First and Second Grade
Personnel, as Rated by Assistant Principals

	Grade 1		Grade 2	
	<u>No. of Ratings</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>	<u>No. of Ratings</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Paired teachers	39	4.0	29	3.9
Single teachers	81	4.2	79	4.2
Ratio teachers	73	4.0	70	3.9
Paraprofessionals	79	3.9	76	4.0
Student teachers	36	4.0	32	4.1

3. Effectiveness of Program, as Rated by Non-Teaching Personnel

Here, too, school and district non-teaching personnel were asked to rate the effectiveness of the total SECE Program in grades 1 and 2. Responses are summarized separately in Table VI-15 and VI-16. In each instance, ratings of teachers have been added to serve as a basis for comparison.

Table VI-15

Ratings of Effectiveness of Total SECE Program
in Grade 1, in Per Cent

<u>Rated By</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Strongly Positive</u>	<u>Somewhat Positive</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Somewhat Negative</u>	<u>Strongly Negative</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
District ECE Supervisor	15	46.7	46.7	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Principal	106	60.4	34.9	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.9
Assistant Principal	90	51.1	36.6	6.6	1.0	0.0	4.4
ECE Coordinator	61	65.5	29.5	3.2	0.0	0.0	1.6
Grade 1 teachers	240*	32.8	41.3	12.5	2.9	0.0	11.3
Paired teachers	76	32.9	39.5	13.5	7.9	0.0	6.6
Single teachers with Parapro- fessional	117	35.1	42.7	13.7	0.8	0.0	7.7
Single teachers without Para- professionals	40	22.5	47.5	7.5	2.5	7.5	12.5

* Includes the responses of seven ratio teachers

Table VI-16

Ratings of Effectiveness of Total SECE Program
in Grade 2, in Per Cent

<u>Rated By</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Strongly Positive</u>	<u>Somewhat Positive</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Somewhat Negative</u>	<u>Strongly Negative</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
District ECE Supervisor	15	20.0	46.7	20.0	0.0	0.0	13.3
Principal	106	48.1	41.5	8.5	0.0	0.0	1.9
Assistant Principal	90	44.4	38.8	10.0	1.1	0.0	5.5
ECE Coordinator	61	57.3	29.5	26.2	0.0	0.0	3.2
Grade 2 teachers	224*	31.3	36.2	15.6	2.2	1.8	12.9
Paired teachers	49	51.0	22.4	8.2	8.2	0.0	10.2
Single teachers with Parapro- fessional	119	28.6	44.5	16.8	0.8	0.8	8.4
Single teachers without Para- professional	46	15.2	37.0	15.2	0.0	6.5	26.1

* Includes the responses of ten ratio teachers

On the first grade level, the ratings of the non-teaching personnel tended to be much more favorable than those of the classroom teachers, with the ratings of the principal and school ECE coordinator being the most favorable of all. Teachers tended to avoid taking an extremely positive position; single teachers without paraprofessional assistance were much less positive than paired teachers or teachers with paraprofessional help.

The pattern of ratings was much the same, with only minor variations, on the second grade level. Again, the ratings of non-teaching personnel tended to be more favorable than those of teachers, taken as a group, and the ratings of teachers without paraprofessional help tended to be less positive than those of their colleagues who had such help or who were paired. Ratings of non-teaching personnel tended to be less positive on the second grade than on the first grade level.

Non-teaching personnel were also asked to rank various aspects of the SECE Program in order of greatest improvement. A summary of their responses is presented in Table VI-17.

Table VI-17

Areas of Greatest Improvement: First Grade Level

Mean Ranking Assigned by School Personnel*

<u>Areas of improvement</u>	<u>District ECE Supervisor</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Assistant School ECE Principal</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>
<u>First Grade</u>				
General academic progress	2.3	2.9	2.4	2.4
Social behavior	2.0	3.3	3.4	4.0
School-parent relations	2.3	4.1	3.6	4.3
Instructional techniques of teachers	2.3	3.6	3.5	3.1
Teachers' control of class	3.8	3.7	3.7	4.2
Materials of instruction used	2.4	3.8	3.7	3.6
Individualization of instruction	1.3	2.9	2.7	2.7
Creative expression of children	2.6	4.7	4.7	4.3
Progress in reading	1.4	3.4	2.9	2.3

(Continued)

<u>Areas of improvement</u>	<u>District ECE Coordinator</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Assistant School ECE Principal</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>
<u>Second Grade</u>				
General academic progress	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.2
Social behavior	1.9	3.2	3.5	3.5
School-parent relations	2.7	4.0	3.2	4.3
Instructional techniques of teachers	2.3	3.6	3.3	2.8
Teachers' control of class	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.3
Materials of instruction used	2.1	3.9	3.7	3.3
Individualization of instruction	1.7	2.8	2.9	2.6
Creative expression of children	2.6	4.6	4.6	3.8
Progress in reading	1.1	2.8	3.2	2.1

* Lowest mean ranking indicates greatest improvement

On both the first and second grade levels, those aspects in which the greatest improvement were made included, in order, individualization of instruction, progress in reading, and general academic progress. Use of materials, instructional techniques, and teacher's control of class, and creative expression of children, however, were not regarded as having improved to any great extent.

4. Problems in Implementing the Program

As on the kindergarten level, both teaching and non-teaching personnel were asked to identify significant problems in organization and implementation of the program at the first and second grade levels. Responses of participating personnel concerning the first grade level are presented in Table VI-18; for the second grade level in Table VI-19.

Table VI-18

Significant Problems in the Organization and Implementation of
the SECE Program on the First Grade Level

Per Cent of Participating Personnel Citing Problem Area

<u>Problem Area</u>	<u>District ECE Coordinator</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Assistant School ECE Principal</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Grade 1 Teachers*</u>
Classroom and other space	71.4	67.0	61.1	63.9	40.4
Class size	50.0	43.4	51.1	49.1	45.0
Materials, including audiovisual	14.3	17.9	17.7	13.1	28.3
Parent relations	14.3	15.1	12.2	14.7	9.6
Community relations	0.0	9.4	8.8	6.5	(a)
Staff relations	14.3	16.0	12.2	8.1	6.3
Teacher training (methods)	28.6	28.3	26.6	13.1	(a)
Teacher training (management, discipline)	28.6	23.6	25.5	16.3	(a)
Overemphasis on reading	7.1	4.7	5.5	6.5	7.5
Underemphasis on on reading	14.3	3.8	3.3	3.2	0.8
Teacher turnover	35.7	24.5	25.5	26.2	(a)
Pupil mobility	28.6	61.3	65.5	59.0	39.6

(a) teachers were not asked to indicate problems in this area

* Includes the responses of seven ratio teachers

Table VI-19

Significant Problems in the Organization and Implementation of
the SECE Program on the Second Grade Level

Per Cent of Participating Personnel Citing Problem Area

<u>Problem Area</u>	<u>District ECE Coordinator</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Assistant School ECE Principal</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Grade 2 Teachers*</u>
Classroom and other space	64.3	59.4	60.0	55.7	33.5
Class size	42.9	41.5	47.7	52.4	44.6
Materials, including audiovisual	14.3	18.9	17.7	11.4	25.9
Parent relations	7.1	16.0	12.2	14.7	14.3
Community relations	7.1	9.4	7.7	8.1	(a)
Staff relations	14.3	16.0	12.2	6.5	5.8
Teacher training (methods)	21.4	34.0	30.0	6.5	(a)
Teacher training (management, discipline)	21.4	32.1	35.5	16.3	(a)
Overemphasis on reading	7.1	18.9	5.5	6.5	6.3
Underemphasis on reading	7.1	4.7	3.3	3.2	2.7
Teacher turnover	42.9	33.0	32.2	24.5	(a)
Pupil mobility	28.6	64.2	61.1	60.6	41.1

(a) Teachers were not requested to indicate problems in this area

* Includes the responses of ten ratio teachers

On the first grade leve, the numbers of children in a given class unit, assigned to the same classroom, was considered a significant problem by approximately one-half of the administrators, coordinators, and teachers

participating in the SECE Program. Classroom and other space was considered a problem by more than 60 per cent of the administrators and coordinators. Teachers were somewhat less involved with this difficulty. However, problems with materials were noted more frequently by teachers than by other personnel.

Pupil mobility was regarded as a significant problem by approximately 60 per cent of the principals, assistant principals, and school ECE coordinators and by 40 per cent of the teachers. In general, pupil mobility became more of a problem in first grade than in kindergarten.

Problems related to teacher training and teacher turnover were also of greater concern in the first grade than on the kindergarten level; approximately one-fourth of the administrators and coordinators reported this as a significant problem.

On the second grade level, difficulties relating to classroom and other space, and the size of classes were frequently cited as significant problems in the organization and implementation of the Program. These problems were noted only slightly less frequently on the second grade than on the first grade level, despite the fewer number of "paired" teacher situations, where many of these problems are centered. Pupil mobility was noted as a significant problem; teacher turnover posed a greater problem on the second grade level than on first. Not surprisingly, in light of the problem of teacher turnover and the greater number of second grade teachers who had not had previous K-2 teaching experience, problems in teacher training were also higher on the second grade level than on the first.

It may also be noted that an overemphasis on reading was considered a problem at the second grade level by almost one-fifth of the principals,

although not by other personnel directly involved in the Program.

These principals did not indicate the causes of this dissatisfaction, and, in relation to the SECE's emphasis on reading, this response seems high; however, in relation to the findings that other subject matter areas have been somewhat neglected in the concentration upon reading in the SECE Program, it comes into focus. Another source of the principal's perception of an overemphasis on reading may be through his contacts with parents and the community; a number of teachers reported that the school had been under considerable pressure to "teach the children to read" and that this pressure had caused a switch in emphasis from the "development of learning through experience" to an emphasis on specific reading programs.

Tables VI-20 and VI-21 present the responses of first and second grade teachers, respectively, concerning significant problems in the organization and implementation of the SECE Program. In these tables, the responses of paired teachers, single teachers with paraprofessionals, and single teachers without paraprofessionals are reported.

Table VI-20

Significant Problems in Organization and Implementation of
SECE Program, as Reported by First Grade Teachers

Per Cent of Teachers Citing Problem Area

<u>Problem Area</u>	<u>Paired Teachers</u>	<u>Single Teachers With Para</u>	<u>Single Teachers Without Para</u>	<u>Total Teachers*</u>
Use of classroom and other space	47.4	35.9	37.5	40.4
Class size	34.2	50.4	50.0	45.0
Materials	27.6	29.1	27.5	28.3
Parent relations	5.3	12.0	10.0	9.6
Relations between staff members	5.3	6.8	5.0	6.3
Discipline of children	27.6	28.2	32.5	28.3
Overemphasis on reading	5.3	8.5	10.0	7.5
Underemphasis on reading	0.0	0.9	2.5	0.8
Individualization of instruction	18.4	24.8	25.0	21.7
Pupil mobility	42.1	39.3	42.5	39.6

* Includes the responses of seven ratio teachers

Table VI-21

Significant Problems in Organization and Implementation of
SECE Program, as Reported by Second Grade Teachers

Problem Area	Per Cent of Teachers Citing Problem Area			
	Paired Teachers	Single Teachers With Para	Single Teachers Without Para	Total Teachers*
Use of classroom and other space	47.1	30.3	30.4	33.5
Class size	46.9	46.2	45.7	44.6
Materials	20.4	32.8	17.4	25.9
Parent relations	14.2	18.5	6.5	14.3
Relationships between staff members	4.1	7.6	4.3	5.8
Discipline of children	26.5	44.5	32.6	32.5
Overemphasis on reading	4.1	7.6	4.3	6.3
Underemphasis on reading	2.0	1.7	4.3	2.7
Individualization of instruction	16.3	26.1	32.6	24.6
Pupil mobility	46.9	41.9	34.8	41.1

* Includes the responses of ten ratio teachers

With the group of first grade responding teachers broken down according to class type, some differences in their perceptions of problems may be seen. Although class size was somewhat less of a problem to paired teachers than to single teachers, the use of classroom and other space was more frequently a source of significant difficulty.

Although 37.5 per cent of the single teachers who had not been assigned the assistance of a paraprofessional considered reduction in

class size as being the element making the greatest contribution to the Program, 50.0 per cent of these teachers still reported that class size was a significant problem. Discipline of children and individualization of instruction were more of a problem in these classes than in paired classes or single classes with paraprofessional assistance, despite the common practice of assigning more able students to these classes.

On the second grade level, single teachers with paraprofessional assistants, perceived greater difficulty in the area of materials, discipline of children, and overemphasis on reading, as well as parent relations. These problems apparently stem from the practice of homogeneous grouping; children who are slow, immature, have difficulties learning to read or who speak English haltingly are more frequently assigned to classes with a paraprofessional assistant. It was not uncommon, on the second grade level in a school for the "low exponent" classes (a euphemism for the more able students in 2-1 or 2-2) to be large classes with a single teacher working alone, and the "high exponent" classes to be much smaller in size with the help of a paraprofessional. In the light of homogeneous grouping, then, the larger incidence of problems in these classes is understandable.

CHAPTER VII

ACHIEVEMENT TEST DATA

A. SECOND GRADE

Scores on the Word Knowledge and Comprehension subtests of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), administered to second grade pupils in the SECE Program as part of the city-wide testing program of the Board of Education, were obtained for children in second grade classes. These children constituted the total population of the schools which comprised the "core sample" and which were visited by the observers.

The analysis of variance technique was employed to determine statistically the differences between the test scores of children in different types of classes; in order to include as large a number of classes as possible, the class means on each of the two subtests were analyzed, rather than the scores of the individual pupils. The use of class means, although reducing the amount of variation generally, does not affect the statistical outcome of the analyses of variance, nor the interpretation, since overall administrative questions are under consideration rather than the performance of individual children.

Several analyses were performed, each designed to determine whether statistically significant differences existed between "paired" classes, single classes with paraprofessional assistance, and single classes without paraprofessional assistance, between classes in schools in which second grade was organized flexibly and those organized inflexibly, and between classes to which different numbers of children had been assigned. All classes in the core sample schools were used in the analyses; in those

analyses in which single classes with paraprofessionals were considered, an independent random sample of 50 per cent of the classes were employed for each analysis.

It will be remembered that in many schools, the "low exponent" classes to which more able students were assigned, were more likely to be comparatively large classes without paraprofessional assistance while the "high exponent" classes frequently were small, had been afforded paraprofessional assistance, and had a large proportion of children with special needs and problems that were expected to interfere with learning. Unfortunately, since tests were not administered to these children as first graders, a pre-test - post-test technique, or analysis of covariance was not possible. Throughout this analysis, it was expected that the common practice of homogeneous grouping, and adjustment of the class size and class type to the needs of the children would be a large, immeasurable source of variation in their second grade reading test scores.

In order to analyze the mean test scores of paired classes (P), single classes with paraprofessional (SP), and single classes with no paraprofessional assigned (SNP) in schools in which the second grade level was organized flexibly or inflexibly, two-way analyses of variance were performed on the class means of the Word Knowledge and Comprehension subtests. Table VII-1 presents the means, standard deviations, and number of classes which formed the basis of the Word Knowledge analysis.

Table VII-1

MAT Word Knowledge Scores, by Class Type and
Organizational Pattern

Organizational Pattern	P			Class Type SP			SNP			Total		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Flexible	2.37	0.35	12	2.39	0.95	25	2.12	0.59	23	2.33	0.63	60
Inflexible	2.40	0.72	22	2.43	0.61	25	2.41	0.75	15	2.41	0.69	62
Total	2.38	0.54	34	2.41	0.78	50	2.31	0.67	38	2.37	0.66	122

The source table for the analysis of variance is shown below; it will be noted that significant differences were not found between different types of classes, nor between different organizational patterns in the scores on the Word Knowledge subtest.

SOURCE TABLE VII-1

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F-ratio	
SS_t	62.15	121.	--		
SS_b	0.58	5.	0.17		
SS_r	0.21	1.	0.21	0.40	n.s.
SS_c	0.19	2.	0.10	0.19	n.s.
SS_{rc}	0.18	2.	0.18	0.17	n.s.
SS_w	61.57	116.	0.53		

In Table VII-2 the means and standard deviations of the scores on the Comprehension subtest and number of classes used in analyzing the results of this subtest according to class type and organizational pattern are presented.

Table VII-2

MAT Comprehension Scores, by Class Type and Organizational Pattern

Organizational Pattern	P			Class Type						Total		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Flexible	2.54	0.42	12	2.41	0.79	25	2.31	0.65	23	2.43	0.62	60
Inflexible	2.24	0.84	22	2.50	0.61	25	2.43	0.60	15	2.39	0.68	62
Total	2.39	0.63	34	2.46	0.70	50	2.37	0.64	38	2.41	0.65	122

The Source Table for the analysis of variance of the Comprehension Subtest scores are presented below. Again, it will be noted that there were no significant differences between the mean scores of paired classes, single classes with paraprofessional assistance and single classes without paraprofessional assistance, nor between the mean scores of classes in schools in which second grade classes are of one type only (inflexible) or of different types (flexible).

SOURCE TABLE VII-2

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F-ratio	
SS _t	58.58	121.	--		
SS _b	1.23	5.	0.25		
SS _r	0.03	1.	0.03	0.06	n.s.
SS _c	0.15	2.	0.08	0.16	n.s.
SS _{rc}	1.04	2.	0.52	1.06	n.s.
SS _w	57.35	116.	0.49		

The means of the children's test scores for Word Knowledge or Comprehension then, did not differ significantly according to class type

or organizational pattern; despite the expectation that single classes without paraprofessional assistance would score higher as a result of the selection procedure mentioned previously. It is also interesting to note that children performed equally well, on the average, whether they were assigned to classes taught by two teachers, or by a teacher and paraprofessional.

Another set of two-way analyses were performed on the Word Knowledge and Comprehension subtests in order to study the combined effects of class size and class type on these test scores. Paired classes were eliminated from this analysis; the large size of the combined registers of most paired classes prevented adequate comparisons.

Table VII-3 presents the means, standard deviations, and numbers of classes which were utilized in the analysis of the Word Knowledge subtest scores between single teacher classes with and without paraprofessional assistance, and between classes of less than 25, 25-29, and 30 or more children on register.

Table VII-3

MAT Word Knowledge Scores, by Class Type and Class Size

<u>Class Size</u>				Class Type			Total		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SP</u> <u>S.D.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SNP</u> <u>S.D.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>N</u>
Less than 25	2.06	0.45	23	2.28	0.50	22	2.17		22
25-29	2.60	0.82	24	2.44	0.69	22	2.52		46
30 or more	3.38	1.18	14	2.48	0.89	17	2.58		31
			61			61			122

The source table for the analysis of variance of Word Knowledge subtest class mean scores for classes of different sizes and types is presented below.

SOURCE TABLE VII-3

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F-ratio
SS _t	90.15	121.	--	
SS _b	20.70	5.	4.14	
SS _r (class size)	15.79	2.	7.90	13.19**
SS _c (class type)	1.15	1.	1.15	1.92 n.s.
SS _{rc}	3.76	2.	1.88	3.14*
SS _w	69.45	116.	0.60	

* significant at .05 level

** significant at .01 level

This analysis reveals that, on the average, the performance of children in the larger classes was significantly higher than that of children in the smaller classes; undoubtedly, the practice of selective placement affected these results. Children in single classes with paraprofessionals did not perform significantly better, on the whole, than did those in single classes without paraprofessionals; however, the significant interaction, and study of the cell means reveals that in classes under 25, SNP classes did better than SP classes, whereas in classes with more than 25 on register, the performance of children in SP classes was superior.

The same analysis was performed on the Comprehension subtest scores; the resulting tables are presented below (Table VII-4).

Table VII-4

MAT Comprehension Scores, by Class Type and Class Size

Class Size	SP			Class Type SNP			Total		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
Under 25	2.14	1.45	23	2.43	0.59	22	2.29	0.52	45
25-29	2.64	0.67	24	2.51	0.62	22	2.58	0.63	46
30 or more	3.20	1.00	14	2.71	0.82	17	2.95	0.91	31
Total	2.66	0.71	61	2.55	0.68	61	2.61	0.69	122

SOURCE TABLE VII-4

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F-ratio
SS _t	68.87	121.	--	
SS _b	12.14	5.	2.43	
SS _r	8.83	2.	4.41	9.03 **
SS _c	0.31	1.	0.31	0.64 n.s.
SS _{rc}	3.00	2.	1.50	3.07 N.S.
SS _w	56.73	116.	0.49	

** significant at the .01 level

The pattern of performance revealed in this analysis follows the direction of the results of the Word Knowledge subtest analysis; children in larger classes performed significantly better than children in smaller classes; the interaction of class size and class type approached, but did not reach, significance at the .05 level.

Another set of analyses, was performed to study the effects of class size on children's performance in second grade in the SECE Program on the Word Knowledge and Comprehension subtests. In this case, the class mean scores of paired classes were included. Despite the assignment of two teachers to a single classroom of 30-40 children, it had been found that many of these classes spent nearly half of the school day with but one teacher. Thus, the combined register of paired classes was used in determining the size of a paired class for this analysis; the class size, here, then, is the "head count," on number of children assigned to a particular classroom.

The means, standard deviations, and numbers of classes in this analysis of the Word Knowledge subtest scores, and the associated source table for this one-way analysis of variance are presented below; the differences between the means of the scores of classes of different sizes were highly significant.

Table VII-5

MAT Word Knowledge Scores, by Class Size

<u>Class Size</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>N</u>
Under 20	2.34	0.44	15
20-24	2.08	0.49	30
25-29	2.51	0.75	40
30-34	2.84	0.98	39
35 or more	2.29	0.65	21

SOURCE TABLE VII-5

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F
SS_t	90.08	142	--	
SS_b	11.05	4	2.76	4.90**
SS_w	79.03	138	0.56	

** significant at .01 level

Remembering that the larger classes were, because of the selective assignment procedures, expected to perform at a higher level, it was not surprising to find that between class sizes of 20 and 35, the larger the class size, the better the mean test scores. However, this analysis reveals an important finding which cannot be attributed to selective assignment.

Despite the assignment in many cases, of children with special needs to small classes, children in classes of less than 20 outshone those in classes of 20-24 children. Children in classes of 35 or more, despite the assignment of two teachers to many of these classes, did not score as highly as did children in classes of 30 to 34.

The one-way analysis of variance performed on the Comprehension subtest scores according to class size are presented in Table VII-6.

Table VII-6

MAT Comprehension Scores, by Class Size

<u>Class Size</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>N</u>
Under 20	2.50	0.52	15
20-24	2.17	0.51	30
25-29	2.49	0.60	40
30-34	2.89	0.83	39
35 or more	2.34	0.54	21

SOURCE TABLE VII-6

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F
SS_t	67.14	142	--	
SS_b	9.10	4	2.28	5.41 **
SS_w	58.04	138	0.42	

** significant at .01 level

A similar pattern is revealed by the analysis of the Comprehension subtest scores; the expected association between mean scores and class size was found for classes between 20 and 35 children; above that size, performance dropped, below that size, performance rose.

Although an interpretation of these analyses must, of course, be tentative because of the lack of statistical control of the selective assignment of children to different classes, several things are apparent.

In general, the children in paired classes, single classes with paraprofessionals and single classes without paraprofessionals perform equally well on the Word Knowledge and Comprehension subtests of the

Metropolitan Achievement Test, as do children in schools whose second grades are flexible and inflexibly arranged.

The most potent source of variance identified in these analyses was that of class size; except for classes which were very large or very small, the larger the class, the better the performance. In single teacher classes which had 25 or more children on register, the presence of a paraprofessional had a positive influence on the children's test scores; in classes of under 25, children in classes without paraprofessional assistance did better than those classes to which paraprofessionals had been assigned.

B. THIRD GRADE

At the request of the Bureau of Educational Research, a special analysis was made of the test scores obtained by a group of pupils, presently in the third grade in the SECE Program, who had been in second grade classes in the same school. A total of 943 such pupils in nine schools were identified, and the progress shown by these students from the date of testing in second grade to the date of testing in third grade, a period of one year, was determined. The results are presented in Table VII-7.

Table VII-7

Mean Growth in Reading Shown by Pupils Presently Enrolled
in Grade 3 in Sample Schools

School	N	Mean (Grade 2)		Mean (Grade 3)		Mean Gain	
		Word Knowledge	Comprehension	Word Knowledge	Reading	Word Knowledge	Comprehension
171M	71	2.4	2.6	3.1	3.3	0.7	0.7
57M	135	2.6	2.6	3.4	3.3	0.8	0.7
140X	90	2.7	2.7	3.6	3.5	0.9	0.8
2K	126	3.5	3.1	5.2	4.0	1.7	0.9
9K	120	3.1	3.3	3.8	3.7	0.7	0.4
250K	124	2.7	2.7	3.3	3.3	0.6	0.6
26K	92	2.4	2.2	3.0	2.9	0.6	0.7
241K	112	3.0	2.9	4.8	3.8	1.8	0.9
116Q	73	2.4	2.5	3.5	3.4	1.1	0.9
Total	943	2.8	2.8	3.8	3.5	1.0	0.7

For the groups as a whole, the growth shown was one full year in Word Knowledge and seven months in Comprehension. Considerable variation was noted from school to school. In general, in those schools in which pupil performance was below grade (2.7) in the second grade, performance in the third grade was as good as, or better than, one would normally expect; in those schools where initial performance was above grade in the second grade, third grade performance was somewhat disappointing. It is difficult to interpret these findings in terms of the objectives of the SECE Program without considerable study in depth of the reading program in each of the participating schools. Unfortunately, the evaluation

design made no provision for such an intensive analysis.

In all but one of the nine schools, growth in Word Knowledge proved to be equal to, or greater than, growth in Comprehension. One possible factor leading to such a pattern of performance might be overemphasis on mechanics of reading. This possible overemphasis has already been considered, it will be remembered, in discussion of the reports made by the observers of classroom activities, and of the evaluations made by school principals and assistant principals.

CHAPTER VIII

ORIENTATION AND TRAINING OF STAFF

1. Training of School ECE Coordinators

Of the 15 District ECE Supervisors who provided information regarding the organization and effectiveness of the SECE Program in their districts, only four (26.7%) reported the organization of training programs for teachers who would serve as school ECE coordinators during the current academic year at the district level.

In one district, the training program had been ongoing since the beginning of the SECE Program. Guidelines and job descriptions were prepared. The group of school ECE coordinators met once monthly; the agenda for the meetings were prepared after consultations with administrators and teachers in the SECE Program. In another district, monthly training sessions were held and individual conferences with school ECE coordinators were conducted during the district supervisor's visit to the school. In another district, workshops for teacher trainers were held by the District ECE Coordinator.

Of the 61 school ECE Coordinators in the sample, 18 (29.5%) reported that their district had organized training programs for school ECE coordinators. Each of the 18 reported that they had participated in the training program.

Table VIII-1 presents the effectiveness of the District training programs for school ECE Coordinators as rated by District and school ECE Coordinators.

Table VIII-1

Effectiveness of District Training Program for School ECE Coordinators, as Rated by District and School ECE Coordinators

	Per Cent of Personnel Assigning Rating					
	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
District ECE Coordinator (N=4)	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
School ECE Coordinator (N=18)	33.3	50.0	11.1	5.6	0.0	0.0

The samples are much too small to permit generalization.

2. ECE Teachers

Training and orientation programs for teachers in the SECE Program were held at both the district and the school level.

On the district level, 11 (73.3%) of the 15 district ECE supervisors reported that training programs for ECE teachers were organized. In two of these districts, however, monthly sessions were held for teachers of pre-kindergarten only. In three districts, newly appointed teachers attended training sessions at the district level.

Workshops and conferences in individual schools were most frequently reported; these were scheduled according to the needs of the schools and were not uniform throughout the district. Of the 11 District ECE supervisors, one (9.1%) rated the effectiveness of the district training program for ECE teachers as excellent, 6 (54.5%) as good, 3 (27.3%) as fair, and 1 (9.1%) as poor.

Orientation and training programs for ECE teachers were held in most schools. Eighty (76.9%) of the principals reported organization of these programs, and furnished brief descriptions of the nature of these programs.

Assistant principals, ECE coordinators, and teachers were also asked to indicate whether or not such programs were conducted in their schools. Table VIII-2 presents this data.

Table VIII-2

Number of Participating Schools in which Orientation
or Training Programs were Conducted for ECE Teachers

<u>As Reported By:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Programs Conducted</u>					
		<u>"Yes"</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>"No"</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>No Response</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Principals	106	80	76.9	24	23.1	2	2.5
Assistant Principals	90	57	63.3	32	35.5	1	1.1
ECE Coordinators	61	46	75.4	14	22.9	1	1.6
Kindergarten Teachers	185	44	23.8	139	75.1	3	1.6
Grade 1 Teachers	240	79	32.9	156	65.0	5	2.1
Grade 2 Teachers	224	74	33.0	142	63.4	8	5.6

District ECE Supervisors (N=10) reported that, of the average 21.8 schools in their districts, 14.6 conducted training programs for Early Childhood teachers. An average of 12.6 schools in each district, however, participated in the SECE program; it was not known in what proportion of participating and non-participating schools these programs were conducted. Five responding District ECE Supervisors did not furnish this information.

Only a small percentage of SECE teachers reported that they had participated in an orientation or training program in their schools; it is apparent that individual and group conferences and workshops were not perceived by teachers as part of a special training program for ECE teachers. Of the 185 kindergarten teachers, 22 (11.9%) reported participation in an orientation or training program; of the 240 first grade teachers,

participation was reported by 43 (17.9%). Of the 224 second grade teachers in the sample, 39 (17.4%) reported participation.

It is very evident that, for the most part, the principals indicating that a training program had been organized in his school did not look upon training of ECE teachers as distinct from other teacher-training activities that were conducted by the school. Thus, approximately 60 per cent of the respondents indicated that training took the form of group conferences (generally grade conferences) held on a regular schedule, while approximately one-half referred to individual conferences with teachers, generally following classroom observations. The organization of workshops and inservice courses was mentioned by 40 (50.0%) of the principals but, here too, the description of workshop content, when given, made it clear that the workshop was not limited to ECE teachers.

Twenty principals, constituting one-fourth of the group, indicated that training of ECE teachers was delegated to the ECE coordinator or to the school's teacher trainer. Approximately 20 per cent of the respondents referred to an orientation program for teachers conducted prior to the opening of school; again, it was not evident that this orientation program was limited to ECE personnel (See Table VIII-3).

Table VIII-3

Provision for Training ECE Teachers, as Reported by Principals

<u>Approach Used</u>	<u>Principals Reporting</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Group or grade conferences	39	37.5
Workshops, in-service courses	27	26.0
Individual conferences, based on observation	27	26.0
Demonstration lessons	13	12.5
Conferences with ECE coordinator	8	7.7
Pre-session orientation	9	8.7
Intervisitation	9	8.7
Conferences with teacher trainer	6	5.8
Provision of materials	4	3.8
Miscellaneous	4	3.8
No teacher training program	24	23.0

The effectiveness of the training program for teachers in the SECE Program was rated by administrators and teachers. Table VIII-4 presents the distribution of ratings of effectiveness assigned to the training program by these personnel.

Table VIII-4

Distribution of Ratings of Effectiveness of Orientation or Training
Program for ECE Teachers in Participating Schools

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>N</u>	Per Cent of Personnel Assigning Rating					
		<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Principal	80	22.5	62.5	13.7	0.0	0.0	1.3
Assistant Principal	57	15.8	73.7	7.0	0.0	0.0	3.5
ECE Coordinator	46	15.2	76.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	2.2
Kindergarten teacher	22	9.1	77.3	9.1	0.0	4.8	0.0
Grade 1 teacher	43	20.9	48.8	27.9	0.0	0.0	2.3
Grade 2 teacher	39	7.7	66.7	20.5	2.6	2.6	0.0

In general, then, it may be concluded that although little in the way of special training was provided for the teachers in ECE classes, other than in those schools that had a staff position for an ECE coordinator, the training that was provided was generally looked upon favorably for participants.

3. Educational Assistants

a. Programs organized at the district level. All 15 District ECE Supervisors responding to the questionnaire reported that training or orientation programs for paraprofessionals assigned to early childhood classes were organized on the district level during the current school year, although one described training sessions for pre-kindergarten paraprofessionals only.

Responsibility for the training of educational assistants in the

the districts was, in most cases, shared by the District ECE coordinator and professional teacher and auxiliary trainers who were assigned to the district and met, with paraprofessionals in more than one school. District curriculum and guidance specialists, in some cases, assisted the District ECE personnel in providing paraprofessional training. In addition, several District ECE personnel cited the participation of paraprofessionals in the City University Career Ladders Program as contributing to their preparation.

Most training programs for paraprofessionals noted by the District ECE Supervisors, however, were conducted within the individual schools under the direction of the school ECE coordinator.

In most cases, paraprofessionals attended weekly meetings. Development of knowledge and skills in curriculum, methods, human relations and child development formed the basis of the training sessions; workshops, lectures, demonstrations, and conferences provided the basic format for the training sessions at the district level.

The District ECE Supervisors rated the district-level training for ECE paraprofessionals; five (33.3%) as excellent, seven (46.7%) as good, two (13.3%) as fair, one (5.7%) as poor. Two (13.3%) did not provide ratings.

In addition, individual schools in 10 of the 14 districts, according to the District ECE Supervisors providing this information, also organized programs to train ECE paraprofessionals; an average of 13.2 schools in each of the eleven district conducted such programs.

b. Programs organized at the school level. A total of 105 principals responded to a question dealing with the organization of a training program for educational assistants in their schools. Seventy-two (68.6%) of these principals indicated that such a training program was organized in their schools. Thirty-two (44.0%) of these respondents noted that the programs in their schools were organized in conjunction with or as a supplement to a training program organized by the district office. Thirty-three (31.0%) of the principals indicated that no training program for educational assistants had been instituted in their schools. Of this group, 17 (52.0%) noted that the educational assistants in their schools participated in the district program.

Assistant principals and teachers were also asked to indicate whether training programs for paraprofessionals had been organized in their schools. Their responses are summarized in Table VIII-4. Many teachers were evidently not cognizant of the existence of such training programs in their schools.

Table VIII-4

Programs to Train Educational Assistants Assigned to ECE Classes

<u>As Reported By</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>"Yes"</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	Programs Conducted			
				<u>"No"</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>No Response</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Principal	106	72	68.6	33	31.1	1	0.9
Assistant Principal	90	56	62.2	31	34.1	3	3.3
Kindergarten Teachers	185	103	55.7	79	42.7	3	1.6
Grade 1 Teachers	240	117	48.8	95	39.6	28	11.7
Grade 2 Teachers	224	135	60.3	73	32.6	16	7.1

A summary of the specific approaches to training of educational assistants that were organized in the respondents' schools is presented in Table VIII-5.

Table VIII-5

Provisions for Training Educational Assistants,
As Reported by Principals

<u>Approach Used</u>	<u>Principals N</u>	<u>Reporting Per Cent</u>
Group Conferences	25	21.0
Individual Conferences	11	9.0
Workshops	14	12.0
Demonstration Lessons	6	5.0
Miscellaneous	18	15.0
Not Indicated	13	11.0
No training program at school level	33	28.0

By far the most common form of training utilized by the individual schools was the group conference and/or workshop, which was cited, either singly or in combination, by 47 (48.0%) of the principals. This generally took the form of a group meeting with the assistant principal or school ECE coordinator, and was given over to a discussion of common problems, to consideration of techniques of working with small groups, or to a general orientation in some curriculum area. Stress was generally placed upon techniques for individualization of instruction in the sessions conducted by the assistant principal or ECE coordinator; at times, another member of the school staff was the major resource person that was called upon. In some instances, both teachers and paraprofessionals attended the training sessions.

A smaller number (17 - 16.0%) of the principals cited individual conferences with teachers as a technique used in training of paraprofessionals. Here, of course, it is difficult to separate specific training sessions from the usual teacher-paraprofessional conference involving procedures to be utilized in furtherance of normal classroom routines, specific activities in a given lesson, and the like. In a sense, then, this is really on-the-job training, and should not be looked upon as a formal, structured training program.

The indications are, then, that the training program for educational assistants tended to be more directive and more closely related to the immediate problems of working with children in early childhood classes than that directed to ECE teachers.

The training programs for educational assistants were more formally organized than those for teachers; thus, even the teachers themselves were more aware of the paraprofessional training programs than the procedures instituted for their own orientation and training. It should be noted, however, that only a small proportion of the ECE teachers in the sample were inexperienced, 4.9 per cent of teachers in kindergarten, 8.3 per cent and 12.5 per cent of first and second grade teachers respectively.

CHAPTER IX

THE ROLE OF THE ECE COORDINATOR

The school ECE coordinator played a central role in the conduct of the ECE Program. In many cases, her responsibilities paralleled or overlapped those of the assistant principal assigned to the early grades. The ECE coordinator generally worked most closely with, and received the greatest amount of assistance from, the primary assistant principal.

1. Role and Relationships

Fifty-four ECE coordinators provided information on the amount of time they spent, on the average, in conferences with supervisors and other school personnel; those who did not respond found it impossible to estimate the amount of time spent in conferences. The average number of hours per week spent in conference, as reported by the group of ECE coordinators, was 3.1 hours. Ranking a list of school personnel in order of the frequency of contact, the ECE coordinators provided further data regarding their time spent in conference, as reported in Table IX-1.

Table IX-1

Conferences Between ECE Coordinators and Other Personnel

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Mean Ranking*</u>
Assistant Principal	1.34
Principal	1.96
NE Coordinator	2.09
Guidance Counselor	2.88
School Nurse, Doctor	3.09
District ECE Coordinator	3.14
School Secretaries	5.27

* Lowest ranking indicates greatest frequency of contact

Of the 61 ECE coordinators responding, 55 or 90.2 per cent said that their role and that of the assistant principal assigned to the primary grades had been clearly differentiated. In each of these cases, the working relationship was perceived as complementary. Areas of overlapping responsibilities, mentioned by fewer than five ECE coordinators in each case, were testing, guidance, placement of students, supervision and training of teachers and paraprofessionals, and administrative duties. One ECE coordinator commented that her philosophy and that of the primary assistant principal differed; another indicated that one of the assistant principals with whom she worked was reluctant to delegate authority; however, these were the only negative comments made about the relationship between assistant principals and ECE coordinators in the Program.

Of the 61 principals who were able to appoint ECE coordinators, 15 (24.6%) reported that this assignment made the work load of the primary assistant principal much lighter. Twenty-nine (47.5%) indicated that the assignment of an ECE coordinator lightened the assistant principal's workload somewhat, nine (14.8%) reported that the assistant principal's workload had remained the same, and four (6.6%) that the workload had become heavier.

Thirty (62.5%) of the 48 assistant principals in schools in which ECE coordinators had been assigned found that their workloads had been lightened somewhat by this assignment; 10 (20.8%) indicated that their workloads had become much lighter. Six (12.5%) stated that their workloads remained the same, and five (10.4%) that they had more work to do as a result of the assignment of the ECE coordinator.

Responses to this question, of course, were dependent upon the relative complexity of school organization and the number of special programs and innovations conducted before and after the appointment of the ECE coordinator. Since no assistant principal regretted the coordinator's appointment, it must be assumed that, in the case of the assistant principals reporting a heavier workload, new approaches and techniques were being tried, creating extra administrative work for the assistant principal.

All but two (59, or 92.2%) of the principals who had been able to assign ECE coordinators indicated that the role of the coordinator and that of the primary assistant principal had been clearly differentiated. In no case was conflict between coordinator and assistant principal reported; two principals mentioned that the assistant principal and the ECE coordinator shared responsibilities in working with teachers, paraprofessionals and parents. Forty-eight assistant principals reported that ECE coordinators had been appointed in their schools; 46 (95.8%) stated that their roles had been clearly differentiated. Again, although a few assistant principals reported that overlapping of responsibilities occurred in the areas of teacher-training and guidance of children, the two assistant principals reporting that responsibilities had not been clearly defined did not cite specific areas of role conflict between assistant principal and ECE coordinator.

In short, the primary assistant principals and ECE coordinators in the schools were able to work together, sharing responsibilities in some areas and dividing responsibilities in others without conflict. The appointment of an ECE coordinator generally reduced the workload of the primary assistant principal; in cases where the assistant principal's

work remained the same or increased, tasks that had remained undone for lack of time were receiving greater attention.

2. Effectiveness

Each principal was asked to rate the effectiveness of his primary assistant principal and ECE Coordinator in furthering the objectives of the ECE program in his school; 92 principals provided ratings of assistant principals. Of the 61 principals who had ECE coordinators, 50 (82.0%) provided ratings. The distribution of ratings of primary assistant principals and ECE coordinators presented in Table IX-2 indicates that the principals viewed them, by and large, as doing an excellent job.

Table IX-2

Effectiveness of AP's and ECE Coordinators in
Furthering the Objectives of the ECE Program, in Per Cent

	<u>N</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Assistant Principal	92	68.5	25.0	6.5	0.0
ECE Coordinator	50	66.0	32.0	1.9	0.0

3. Participation of the ECE Coordinator in Planning

Of the 61 ECE coordinators, 55 (90.2%) were involved in planning for the ECE Program for the current year in their schools. The major types of activities in which they participated are reported in Table IX-3.

Table IX-3

Participation of School ECE Coordinator in
Planning of School ECE Program

ECE Coordinators Reporting		
<u>Type of Participation</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Consulting with ECE teachers	55	100.0
Consulting with school principal on teacher needs, class organization, etc.	53	96.3
Consulting with paraprofessionals	41	74.5
Determining school needs for personnel materials, space, etc.	40	72.7
Organizing workshops for parents	35	63.6
Consulting with district ECE coordinators	34	61.8
Organizing workshops for ECE teachers	31	56.4
Organizing workshops for paraprofessionals	28	50.9
Preparing written guides for utilization of space and materials	23	41.8

In addition, 27 ECE coordinators reported that they had participated in other activities related to planning the ECE program. Most of these (16, or 59.3%) reported the examination, distribution and demonstration of materials, or the instruction of teachers and paraprofessionals. Other activities mentioned included the testing and grouping of children for instruction, as well as working with other funded programs in their schools.

4. Time Allocations by Grade Level

The school ECE coordinators were requested to indicate the proportion of their time which had been devoted to the various Early Childhood Education

programs in their schools. On the average, the group of 61 ECE coordinators devoted 3.5 per cent of their time to pre-kindergarten programs, 16.0 per cent to kindergarten, 40.2 per cent to Grade 1, and 28.1 per cent of their time to Grade 2. An additional 10.0 per cent of the time of the ECE coordinators as a group was spent on activities not related to early childhood education during the current school year. There was, however, additional variation in the assignment of responsibilities to the ECE coordinators in different schools; not all ECE coordinators were assigned to tasks at each grade level. Only 13 (21.3%) of the ECE coordinators were involved with pre-kindergarten programs, 43, 57, and 51 (70.5, 93.4 and 83.6%) had responsibilities for kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 programs, respectively. Thirty-seven (60.7%) of the ECE coordinators reported time devoted to activities other than Early Childhood Education; only 24 (39.3%) devoted their time exclusively to pre-kindergarten through second grade activities.

5. The Role of the ECE Coordinator in Teacher Training

Three quarters (46, or 75.4%) of the ECE coordinators reported that training programs for ECE teachers were organized in their schools. Only thirty-five (76.1%), however, participated in this training program. Of these, 21 reported that they had spent, on the average, 3.33 hours per week in this training program with kindergarten teachers, 35 spent a mean of 7.34 hours per week in the training program with first grade teachers, and 31, an average of 6.39 hours per week with teachers on the second grade level. A total of 14.06 hours per week, on the average, was reported spent in training or orientation programs for kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 teachers by the 35 ECE coordinators.

The ECE coordinators worked closely with the school's primary assistant principal; in fact, all 35 of the ECE coordinators who participated in teacher training programs in their schools indicated that they had received help in organizing this program from the assistant principal.

The assistant principal, as reported by the ECE coordinators, consulted with and advised the ECE coordinator, participated in workshops and conferences and assisted with the organization and coordination of programs, with materials, and with supervision of teachers, evaluation, and guidance (See Table IX-4).

Table IX-4

Ways in Which Assistant Principal
Helped ECE Coordinator with Teacher Training Program

<u>Area of Assistance</u>	ECE Coordinators Reporting	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Consultation and advice	12	34.3
Organizing and coordinating programs, arranging schedule changes, demonstration lessons, etc.	11	31.4
Participating in workshops and conferences	11	31.4
Assistance with materials	8	22.9
Supervision, evaluation, guidance	6	17.1

Nineteen of the 35 ECE coordinators who had responsibility for teacher training programs noted the assistance of the principal in organizing the programs; suggestions made by the principals during discussions (37.1%) with the coordinator were the main forms of assistance reported. Five ECE coordinators (14.3%), indicated that the principal had organized

or coordinated the programs; three others (8.6%) noted that the principal had assisted with general supervision or evaluation. The District ECE supervisor was reported to have given assistance to the ECE coordinator in eleven cases (31.4%); suggestions and recommendations of materials and techniques were made through discussions and demonstrations. Two ECE coordinators noted that the District ECE supervisor had presented guidelines for workshops to foster parental involvement and paraprofessional training.

Many District ECE supervisors, it will be remembered, directed most of their attention to those schools in their districts which did not have the services of an ECE coordinator.

Teacher trainers were mentioned by four ECE coordinators as assisting in the conduct of teacher training programs; and administrative assistant, TESL, consultants from the NYC Division of Personnel, and a book company, were each cited as helpful in teacher training by one ECE coordinator each in the selection, demonstration, and ordering of new materials and supplies. A representative of the District Title I office was noted as providing teacher training assistance by setting up training sessions and observations in model schools.

Although only 35 (57.4%) of the ECE coordinators responding reported having participated in teacher training programs in their schools, 50 of the 61 (81.9%) indicated that they had participated in teacher training activities; apparently, many ECE coordinators did not perceive their assistance and recommendations to individual teachers as being part of a formal training program. An average of 10.36 hours per week spent in teacher training was reported by this group of ECE coordinators; they

also ranked various teacher training activities in order of the amount of time spent at each activity. Table IX-5 presents the mean of each activity ranked.

Table IX-5

Time Spent at Teacher Training Activities
by ECE Coordinators (N=50)

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Mean Ranking*</u>
Training individual teachers	2.31
Helping teachers with learning problems of individual children	2.42
Giving demonstration lessons	3.06
Helping teachers with behavior problems of individual children	3.19
Training groups of teachers	3.21

* Lowest ranking indicates greatest amount of time spent

The (20.0%) of the ECE coordinators reported spontaneously that the ordering, preparation, and distribution of materials were among their teacher training activities; ten of the 13 who reported administrative responsibilities, also cited the distribution of materials as among their tasks. These activities, it seems, were among the important responsibilities of some of the ECE coordinators, and considered to be either a part of their teacher training or their administrative responsibilities.

6. Administrative Responsibilities of the ECE Coordinator

Forty-nine (80.3%) of the 71 ECE coordinators indicated that they spent time at administrative tasks; 6.98 hours, on the average, was reported. Administrative activities were ranked by these ECE coordinators. Their mean rankings are reported in Table IX-6.

Table IX-6

Time Spent in Administration by ECE Coordinators

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Mean Ranking*</u>
Assigning personnel (including paraprofessionals and student teachers)	1.52
Assigning use of classroom space	1.93
Grouping classes	2.01
Ordering books and equipment	2.04
Scheduling and arranging trips	2.32
Writing reports	2.54

* Lowest ranking indicates greatest amount of time spent

Forty-eight (78.7%) of the ECE coordinators reported that they spent time in evaluation. Of these, an average of 3.79 hours per week was spent in this area. The activities related to evaluation were ranked in order of the greatest amount of time spent; the means of these rankings are presented in Table IX-7.

Table IX-7

Time Spent in Evaluation by ECE Coordinators

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Mean Ranking*</u>
Grouping or regrouping	1.55
Preparing teachers for test administration	1.83
Studying records of children	1.85
Constructing tests	2.13
Giving tests	2.19

* Lowest ranking indicates greatest amount of time spent

Seven ECE coordinators also noted that they were engaged in the observation and evaluation of teachers, student teachers, and paraprofessionals.

A mean of 3.02 hours per week was spent working with parents by 45 (73.8%) of the ECE coordinators. Ranked in order of the greatest amount of time spent with parents, these activities are reported in Table IX-8.

Table IX-8

Time Spent with Parents by ECE Coordinators

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Mean Ranking*</u>
Conferences about individual pupil	1.40
Relationship between parent and teacher	1.68
Interpreting school program	1.81

* Lowest ranking indicates greatest amount of time spent

Other activities in which the ECE coordinators noted that they engaged in with parents included workshops and group conferences. One school ECE coordinator reported that she was highly involved with the District-wide program to foster parental involvement and that most of her time was spent with parents.

7. The Teaching Role of the School ECE Coordinator

In some schools, the ECE coordinator taught classes in the ECE program on a regular schedule; in others, she substituted for absent classroom, ratio, or cluster teachers on rare occasions. In 29 (47.5%) of the schools in which there was an ECE coordinator, she had no direct teaching role.

Although 32 (52.5%) of the 61 ECE coordinators responding reported that they spent time in teaching, only 24 (39.3%) were scheduled on a regular basis for total class, small group, or individual instruction. Of these, five spent 15 hours per week or more teaching children; and were less involved with teacher training, administrative, and other duties. The teaching role of the eight ECE coordinators who did not teach regularly was limited to demonstration lessons or series of demonstration lessons in the presence of classroom teachers.

8. Summary

The ECE coordinators, as a group spent their greatest amount of time in teacher training, (8.49 hours per week) and perceived that to be the area in which their greatest contribution to the program was made. Administrative duties, particularly the selection, ordering, distribution and demonstration of materials and equipment absorbed the next largest portion of the time, (5.61 hours per week) of the coordinators as a group, and were regarded, after teacher training, as the area in which greatest contribution had been made.

Approximately half (52.5%) of the coordinators reported teaching duties; this group was more involved in teaching than with administrative responsibilities.

Table IX-9 summarizes the data regarding the ECE coordinator's participation in the various activities of the SECE Program.

Table IX-9

ECE Coordinators Reporting Participation in Various Activities

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Coordinators Participating</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Teaching	32	52.5
Teacher Training	50	82.0
Administration	49	80.3
Evaluation	48	78.7
Conferences with School Personnel	52	85.5
Parents	45	73.8

The ECE coordinators reporting responsibilities in these areas spent varying amounts of time in each area. The hours per week spent in each area, is presented in Table IX-10 in terms of the mean number of hours spent by those actually participating, and in terms of the mean number of hours spent by the group of ECE coordinators as a whole.

Table IX-10

Mean Hours Per Week Spent in Various Activities by ECE Coordinators

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Of Those Reporting</u>		<u>Of the Total Group</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean Hours</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean Hours</u>
Teaching	32	8.41	61	4.41
Teacher Training	50	10.36	61	8.49
Administration	49	6.98	61	5.61
Evaluation	48	3.79	61	2.98
Conferences with School Personnel	52	3.25	61	2.77
Parents	45	3.02	61	2.23

The ECE coordinators ranked these areas of activities in order as to the areas in which they were able to make the greatest contribution to the ECE Program. The mean rankings assigned by the ECE Coordinators to these areas are presented in Table IX-11.

Table IX-11

Greatest Contribution to ECE Program by ECE Coordinators

<u>Areas</u>	<u>Mean Ranking by ECE Coordinators</u> (N=61) *
Teacher Training	1.90
Materials and equipment	2.90
Contacts with supervisors	3.01
Administration	3.22
Contacts with parents	3.68
Evaluation	3.78

* Lowest ranking indicates greatest contribution

CHAPTER X

THE ROLE OF THE PARAPROFESSIONAL

The evidence presented thus far in this report indicates that the presence of the paraprofessional assistant in the early childhood classroom has helped to strengthen the educational program, either through direct teaching of a small group or through individualized remedial work with the slower children. The paraprofessional also contributed to the program indirectly, by relieving the teacher of routine chores, such as the preparation of materials and maintenance of records, so that the teacher was able to devote more time and attention to teaching.

The paraprofessional obtained most of her training "on-the-job," or in workshops or training sessions directly oriented to classroom functions. Thus, the amount of experience the paraprofessional had in her role directly affected her usefulness and her ability to take over routines and teaching functions. According to one assistant principal, "the paraprofessional has been an invaluable asset in the early childhood classroom. We try to be selective in hiring our educational assistants but we have found there is tremendous turnover. Perhaps with a better pay scale and an extension of the Career Ladder Program to include many more paraprofessionals, the staff may become more stable. With stability, our educational assistants will be a more experienced group, and, therefore, a more capable group. Although I do appreciate the extra materials and supplies which the Strengthening Early Childhood Program has given the schools I would prefer that money spent for materials and supplies be used to build up the Career Ladder

Program. The presence of the Educational Assistant in the classroom is a far more valuable item than all the extra materials."

Of the 331 paraprofessionals responding to the questionnaire, 309 (93.4%) reported previous experience as an educational assistant or teacher aide; of these, a mean of 2.43 years of experience was reported. Despite reports of high turnover and dissatisfaction with the employment situation, particularly the lack of security and adequate compensation, the schools appear to have build up a relatively stable, dedicated staff of paraprofessionals.

Thus, in the three years since the SECE Program was first instituted, the paraprofessionals have become a valuable, if not indispensable part of the Early Childhood Program. Many teachers, in fact, take their assistance for granted, not realizing that the paraprofessional is a part of an innovative, experimental program. Most teachers who had the assistance of a paraprofessional regarded that help as contributing most to the Program (58.9% of all the kindergarten teachers, 64.9% of all first grade and 56.3% of all the second grade teachers cited this assistance); others cited the small group and individual instruction which were, again, facilitated by the presence of the paraprofessional.

In general, paraprofessionals were of most help in relieving teachers of routines, preparing materials and teaching children; the emphasis gradually shifted from help with routines and materials to teaching in the first and second grade.

Table X-1 presents a distribution of responses of teachers in regard to the areas of assistance; these responses were discussed, also, in the chapters regarding the effectiveness of the Program at the different grade levels.

Table X-1

Aspects of the SECE Program in which Paraprofessionals Were
Most Helpful, as Reported by Teachers

<u>Aspect of Program</u>	Per Cent of Teachers Citing Aspect		
	<u>Kindergarten</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
Controlling behavior of children	33.5	35.3	27.7
Teaching children	44.1	58.3	68.6
Keeping records	31.8	26.6	40.1
Preparing materials	87.2	56.1	53.3
Handling audiovisual materials	17.3	13.7	10.9
Relieving teachers of routines, etc.	74.9	65.5	62.0

Table X-2 presents the responses of the administrators and coordinators in regard to areas of paraprofessional assistance; their perceptions do not differ from those of the teachers'.

Table X-2

Aspects of the SECE Program in which Paraprofessionals Were
Most Helpful, as Reported by Administrators and Coordinators

<u>Aspect of Program</u>	Per Cent of Personnel Citing Aspect			
	<u>District ECE Coordinator</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Assistant Principal</u>	<u>School ECE Coordinator</u>
Controlling behavior of children	40.0	42.5	34.4	44.2
Teaching children	87.7	66.0	50.0	59.0
Keeping records	0.0	9.4	16.6	22.9
Preparing materials	60.0	62.2	55.5	54.0
Handling audiovisual materials	0.0	13.2	15.5	6.5
Relieving teachers of routines	87.7	82.1	73.3	78.6

The paraprofessionals themselves were asked, on the questionnaire, to "write in" their most important duties. Although a wide range of activities was reported, the perception of the paraprofessionals in regard to their responsibilities did not differ from those of the professional personnel; the responses reveal a similar distribution. It was decided to report the paraprofessionals' responses in a more comprehensive manner, however, providing a more detailed perspective of the paraprofessionals' activities in kindergarten, first, and second grade. Table X-3 presents these responses.

Table X-3

Assistance to Class Group, As Reported by Paraprofessionals

	Kindergarten		Grade 1		Grade 2	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Help with routines, snacks, money	42	28.8	12	12.5	9	10.3
Help with trips, library, errands within school	7	4.8	4	4.2	6	6.9
Help with clean-up, housekeeping, free play	15	10.3	1	1.1	0	0.0
Covering class, keeping order	14	9.6	14	14.6	12	13.8
Preparing materials	32	21.9	25	26.0	12	13.8
Handling audiovisual materials	6	4.1	2	2.2	0	0.0
Clerical work, attendance records	40	27.4	32	33.3	23	26.4
Displaying children's work, decorating room	13	8.9	13	13.5	10	11.5
Reading group or readiness activities	12	8.2	43	44.8	31	35.6

(Continued)

	Kindergarten		Grade 1		Grade 2	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Mathematics group	8	5.5	15	15.6	20	22.9
Other language arts instruction	47	32.2	22	23.0	17	19.5
Planning with teacher	5	3.4	0	0.0	2	2.3
Gave children confidence, affection, attention, reassurance	13	8.9	8	8.3	6	6.9
Help with health records, tests, problems	8	5.5	1	1.0	7	8.0
Remedial instruction - slow learners, absentees	21	14.4	16	16.7	22	25.3
Advanced work for able pupils	1	0.7	0	0.0	2	2.3
Grading of papers, homework, workbooks	1	0.7	15	15.6	18	20.7
Individualized reading, mathematics	12	8.2	20	20.8	12	13.8
Help with teacher-initiated parent-teacher communication	4	2.7	2	2.2	0	0.0
Help with parent-initiated parent-teacher communication	2	1.4	1	1.1	4	4.6
Help improve parent-teacher communication	7	4.8	6	6.3	3	3.4
Alert teacher to community and individual needs	5	3.4	1	1.1	3	3.4
Translate for teacher and non-English child and parent	3	2.1	4	4.2	3	3.4
Teach English to non-English speaking child	8	5.5	7	7.3	5	5.7
General help for non-English speaking child	13	8.9	6	6.3	4	4.6

Although most of the paraprofessionals were assigned full time to a single classroom, they frequently had other school responsibilities to fulfill. When added to participation in training programs or the Career Ladder Program during school hours, the time spent at out-of-classroom duties reduced the number of hours actually served on classroom duty. Table X-4 presents the responses of the paraprofessionals regarding the "out of classroom" duties to which they were assigned.

Table X-4
Out of Classroom Duties Reported by
Paraprofessionals

	Kindergarten		Grade 1		Grade 2	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Bus and Hall Duties	26	17.8	22	22.9	14	16.1
Lunchroom	9	6.2	35	36.5	28	32.2
School Library	2	1.4	5	5.2	2	2.3
School Office	12	8.2	6	6.3	5	5.7
Duties in More than One Classroom	2	1.4	10	10.4	11	12.6
No Outside Duties	100	68.5	18	18.8	27	31.0

In general, paraprofessionals assigned to kindergarten classes were not requested to fulfill many other responsibilities, while most of those serving first and second grade classes had other duties which cut into classroom time. (A paraprofessional serving on lunchroom duty, of course, must take her own lunch hour during class time.)

One problem noted by paired teachers was that the "diffusion of authority" between two adults of equal authority in the classroom confused the children, and had a detrimental effect on their behavior.

This difficulty was rarely noted in teacher-paraprofessional situations.

The suggestions made by paraprofessionals for improvement of the program included the institution of joint workshops and conferences for teachers and paraprofessionals and the planning of the instructional program as a team (teacher and paraprofessional). Of the 68 suggestions made regarding teacher-paraprofessional communication, 48 (70.6%) were made in this regard. Some paraprofessionals, however, indicated that they were included in planning; one stated that she knew she was helpful because the teacher "includes me in planning, and we work together on everything that is done in the classroom," another, that "we work together and she plans her program so that we both fit in, and the children look up to both of us."

In general, the problems which the paraprofessionals stated were associated with the early childhood education program in the schools reflected attitudes which were not critical of the school program, but indicated an awareness of the same difficulties which have long been recognized by professional personnel, few of which are under the direct control of the school.

Table X-5 presents the perceptions of the responding paraprofessionals regarding problems in the SECE program in the classrooms to which they had been assigned.

Table X-5

Problems in the Classroom, as Perceived by Paraprofessionals

	Paraprofessionals Reporting	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Behavior of disruptive or disturbed children	54	40.6
Special needs of non-English speaking children	19	14.3
Lack of parental involvement	15	11.3
Overcrowding	9	6.8
Insufficient materials, facilities	7	5.3
Teacher-paraprofessional communication	5	3.8
Out-of-classroom duties	3	2.3
Other	10	7.5
No problems	11	8.3

CHAPTER XI
PARENT INVOLVEMENT PROGRAMS

1. Programs Organized at the District Level

Nearly all of the 15 District ECE Supervisors responding to the questionnaire (13, or 86.7%) reported that programs to foster parental involvement in the education of their young children were organized by their districts. Their descriptions of these programs, however, indicated that, with few exceptions, these parent involvement programs were organized and conducted in the individual schools. Two District ECE Supervisors had the assistance of paraprofessional "Parent Program Assistants" who organized workshops, brought in speakers, and took parents on educational and cultural trips. In another district, a Parent Program Assistant worked primarily with the family assistants on the pre-kindergarten level; four district wide sessions were held to share the ideas, techniques, and resource information of family assistants assigned to each school.

In several schools in which the position of ECE coordinator had been filled, workshops were held for parents on an on-going basis under the direction of the school ECE coordinator; one District ECE Supervisor indicated that she organized parent workshops in those schools that did not have the services of an ECE coordinator. Another District ECE Supervisor reported that efforts by the district to organize a parent involvement program a few years ago had failed; however, she conducted parent workshops on early childhood education when requested to do so by the schools. In another district, the District ECE Supervisor worked with personnel within each school to coordinate their own several parent

programs; most District ECE coordinators described the various parent involvement activities organized and conducted within the individual schools as having been organized by the district.

It is not surprising that the District ECE coordinators, who perceived the parent involvement programs as organized by the district, also rated the effectiveness of the programs highly. Of the 15 District ECE coordinators who provided ratings, 3 (20.0%) rated them as excellent, 8 (53.3%) as good, and 3 (20.0%) as fair.

2. Programs Organized at the School Level

Principals, assistant principals, and teachers in the sample of participating schools were asked to provide information regarding the implementation and effectiveness of Parent Involvement Programs organized within the individual schools. In Table XI-1, the extent to which programs were organized in schools, as reported by several categories of personnel, is summarized. It is evident that either many teachers were unaware of the existence of a program of parent involvement in their schools, or that they failed to consider what was being done in the way of seeking to involve parents as equivalent to a "program."

Table XI-1

Parent Involvement Programs in Participating Schools

<u>As reported by</u>	<u>Programs Conducted</u>		<u>No Program</u>		<u>No Response</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Principal (N=106)	90	84.9	13	12.3	3	2.8
Assistant Principal (N=90)	72	80.0	17	18.9	1	1.1
Kindergarten teachers (N=185)	107	57.8	77	41.6	1	.5
Grade 1 teachers (N=240)	129	53.8	107	44.6	4	1.7
Grade 2 teachers (N=224)	122	54.5	92	41.1	10	4.5

Parent involvement programs in the individual schools took many forms. Principals, who described the nature of the Parent Involvement Programs in their schools, indicated that workshops (43.4%) and parent meetings (33.4%) were the most common type of provision made to foster parent involvement. Social activities, trips and mothers' clubs, were also organized in 28.3 per cent of the schools. The provision of a family room was reported by eight (7.5%) of the principals; in eleven (10.4%) of the schools, family assistants and social workers worked with parents (Table XI-2).

Table XI-2

Activities to Foster Parent Involvement,
as Reported by Principals (N=106)

<u>Approach Used</u>	<u>Principals Reporting</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Workshops	46	43.4
Parent Association meetings	36	33.4
Social Activities (teas, etc.)	17	16.0
Trips	9	8.5
Mothers Clubs	4	3.8
Family Rooms	8	7.5
Family Assistants, Social Workers	11	10.4
Parent Education program	4	3.8
Classroom Observations	15	14.2
Parent-Teacher conferences	9	8.5
Distribution of Brochures	5	4.8
Miscellaneous	6	5.7
Not indicated	6	5.7
No Parent Involvement Program	13	12.3

The Parent Involvement Programs were rated by principals, assistant principals, and teachers in the sample schools. The effectiveness of the programs for parental involvement in the participating schools, as perceived by these administrators and teachers, is presented in Table XI-3.

Table XI-3

Ratings of Effectiveness of Parent Involvement Programs

<u>Rated By</u>	<u>Per Cent of Personnel Assigning Rating</u>					
	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	<u>No Response</u>
Principal (N=92)	12.2	41.1	38.8	4.4	1.1	2.2
Assistant Principal (N=72)	18.1	43.1	26.4	11.1	1.4	0.0
Kindergarten Teachers (N=107)	10.3	34.6	22.4	18.7	.9	13.1
Grade 1 Teachers (N=129)	7.0	30.2	31.8	10.9	3.1	17.0
Grade 2 Teachers (N=122)	4.1	37.7	27.0	12.3	3.3	15.6

In general, special programs designed to foster parental involvement did not receive high ratings for effectiveness. Many principals and assistant principals noted that although the programs were well planned, attendance was very poor.

Responses to a question directed to teachers, concerning the effect of the SECE Program on the teachers' relationship to parent and community, are of interest here. These responses are summarized in Table XI-4.

Table XI-4

Perceptions of Teachers in Regard to Effect of SECE Program on Relationship of Teacher to Parents and Community, in Per Cent

	<u>N</u>	<u>Program Had Effect</u>	<u>Program Had No Effect</u>	<u>Not Sure</u>
Kindergarten Teachers	185	62.7	14.1	23.2
Grade 1 Teachers				
Paired	76	36.8	22.4	40.8
Single with Paraprofessional	117	40.2	28.2	31.6
Single, No Paraprofessional	40	40.0	22.5	37.5
Total Grade 1 Teachers ^(a)	240	40.4	24.6	35.0
Grade 2 Teachers				
Paired	49	40.8	24.5	34.7
Single, with Paraprofessional	119	45.4	31.1	23.5
Single, no Paraprofessional	46	45.7	15.2	39.1
Total Grade 2 Teachers ^(b)	224	42.9	26.3	30.8

(a) Includes 7 ratio teachers

(b) Includes 10 ratio teachers

The schools' special program of parent involvement was generally noted more frequently and rated more highly by the kindergarten teacher than by teachers in grades 1 and 2. Similarly, kindergarten teachers viewed the total effect of the SECE Program on parental and community relationships more favorable than their colleagues in the other ECE grades; 62.7 per cent of the kindergarten teachers felt that the Program had been effective in this respect, as opposed to approximately 40 per cent of first and second grade teachers.

It should be noted that many teachers indicated that the paraprofessional was able to "act as a liaison in interpreting the school's program to the parents," and in interpreting the community to the teacher. ("The paraprofessional has been able to inform me as to the needs and feelings of

the community of which she is a resident.")

To many teachers, the paraprofessional was an important factor in the development of sound relationships with parents. According to one kindergarten teacher, "parents feel more comfortable relating to the educational assistant since they know her as a member of the community. This had had the effect of bringing more parents into the classroom to observe our program, and has brought about a warmer relationship between parent and teacher." A teacher of a second grade class reports "my paraprofessional has helped very much to create a warm relationship between the parents and me." Another teacher reported "I spend more time now in the community just chatting with kids and parents - it's a tentative tie that will grow stronger but I feel encouraged because the paraprofessional helped me feel good about getting more involved with parents."

Avenues of communication do seem to be opening, not through specially designed parent workshops, but less formally through the teachers, particularly those to whom paraprofessional assistance is afforded. It should be noted, however, that some teachers may not be prepared to cope with the problems that will invariably accompany this communication. Thus, one teacher recommends "a program of education for newly arrived parents, telling them how to obtain medical and social services, free school lunch, legal advice, and medical assistance. I had several parents come to me with problems - sick children, no heat in winter, lost jobs, etc." Obviously, this teacher, and many others like her, need help in learning how to work with parents.

CHAPTER XII

SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING CHILDREN

Many children in the SECE Program, mainly of Puerto Rican background, face a special roadblock to learning the prerequisite of learning to understand and communicate in English as a second language in order to function academically. Special provisions made in the school program to accelerate the learning of English, would certainly be considered in the interest of achieving the goals of the SECE Program. Assistant principals were asked, therefore, to describe the special arrangements which had been made in their schools for the teaching of English to children in the early grades who spoke English haltingly or not at all.

In all, 78 assistant principals provided estimates of the percentage of children in their schools who spoke English haltingly or not at all. The mean proportion of children in each grade level who were reported as failing in this category were as follows: kindergarten - 19.7 per cent; first grade - 17.8 per cent; second grade - 15.1 per cent. In 12 additional schools, the assistant principals were unable to provide estimates of the non-English speaking children on register, although they reported that there were indeed such children in attendance, and described the special activities that had been arranged for them.

All of the schools which non-English speaking children attended made some special provision for teaching English to them. In 55 (70.5%) of the schools, professional personnel, either a non-English coordinator or a teacher of English as a Second Language (TESL), or both, or a bilingual teacher assigned as a cluster teacher worked with small groups of non-English speaking children, usually on a regular schedule. In some

schools, the children received this service daily; in others, weekly. In most schools, children in ECE classes shared the services of the NE coordinator and the TESL, who tended to focus their attention on children in the higher grades, where the need to learn English was felt more acutely. Few kindergarten children received the attention of these specially trained and skilled personnel.

Placing the young non-English speaking child in a classroom served by a Spanish speaking adult provides a means of overcoming the language barrier. Not only can such an adult explain routines and tasks to the new arrival, but she can help him learn, using Spanish if necessary, and bolster the child's self-esteem during this difficult time by providing encouragement and a model of bilingual ability.

Bilingual paraprofessionals assigned to ECE classes were cited by 34 (43.6%) of the assistant principals as a major resource in the teaching of English as a Second Language. In 14 (18.0%) of the schools, bilingual paraprofessionals were employed under separately funded programs, such as the "Language Helper Program", in which bilingual paraprofessionals were specially trained and met with small groups of non-English speaking children. In 11 (14.1%) of the schools, classroom teachers were responsible for teaching English to these children; special "language emphasis" lessons were given daily in nine of these schools. Only rarely were special classes formed for children learning English as a second language.

CHAPTER XIII

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the opinion of the evaluation team, the program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools should be recycled. This recommendation, however, does not mean that the program, taken as a whole, is not without weaknesses. There are some elements in the program that have very positive effects; there are others where the effectiveness of current practices may be questioned. The discussion that follows is directed to a consideration of selected aspects of the total program, and to the development of a series of recommendations which, it is felt, will serve to improve the existing program.

1. Program Organization

At the present time, the SECE Program operates, in large measure, on a decentralized basis. The individual district superintendents are given considerable leeway in organizing classes and assigning personnel within the general guidelines established by the Board of Education. This constitutes an excellent arrangement, and it should be continued as the Program is recycled.

The members of the evaluation team feel, however, that this process of decentralization should be extended still further, and that the individual school be given considerably more freedom to organize classes and assign personnel in accordance with its needs, as determined by its own administrators and staff. At present, the district office may virtually control the total organization of the ECE classes in a given school by virtue of its control of personnel; in many instances, principals felt that the pattern of organization mandated in this fashion was not as

suitable for their schools as some other approach might have been.

It is highly likely that, had the individual schools been given greater freedom in class organization by the local district, fewer paired classes would have been established. In too many instances, this approach to reducing class size or pupil-teacher ratios proved to be ineffective. Teachers, in some cases, found that conflict developed when two persons of equivalent authority shared a room; equal division of responsibilities was a difficult task; children, at times, found the situation confusing. Perhaps most damaging was the need to supervise extremely large groups when one teacher was out of the room, for a preparation period, for lunch, or for some other reason. Many teachers reported that, in effect, they taught a class of 40 children for more than half a day, when assigned as a paired teacher.

The observers would hesitate to recommend the abolition of paired classes in every instance; in some schools, the paired class was a highly successful entity; they would recommend, however, that the individual school be given greater latitude in determining whether it should organize paired classes, in meeting the standard of 40 per cent of classes at a maximum level of 15 in grade 1 or 20 in grade 2.

One other concept in the total organizational structure of the SECE Program needs considerable clarification - the "ratio" or "cluster" teachers. In many of the individual schools, the classroom teacher is completely unfamiliar with these terms, and often uses them interchangeably with such terms as "quota" teacher, "above quota" teacher, "absence" teacher, or "prep period" teacher. In other schools, where the meaning of ratio teacher is clear, their use in the classroom leaves much to be desired. The ratio teacher, in such cases, tends to

be used as a replacement for the classroom teacher during lunch, "prep" periods, administrative assignments, and the like. It was unusual to find the ratio or cluster teacher being used as a member of a team that was charged with responsibility for the activities of a group of children.

Recommendations

- a. Extend decentralization of the SECE Program from the local school district to the individual school, by permitting the school greater leeway in organization of SECE classes and assignment of personnel, in accordance with the needs of the school.
- b. In organizing ECE programs in individual schools, the inclusion of paired classes within the total organizational structure should be approached cautiously; a decision to organize such classes should be based upon the combined judgment of the administrative and teaching staff of the school, and should not be mandated by the local school district.
- c. Individual school principals should make the role of each staff member within the ECE program clear to all other staff members; in particular, the duties and functions of the "ratio" teacher must be clarified, and a program in which the ratio teacher is utilized as a team member, rather than as a replacement, must be developed.

2. The Kindergarten Program

Of all the aspects of the kindergarten programs observed, instruction in content areas, such as mathematics, science, etc., were observed less frequently and rated less highly than any other aspect of the Program. It

would appear that opportunities to achieve the objectives of the SECE Program in language and concept development have been lost in the failure to organize well structured programs in content areas, which would provide experiences upon which language learnings are built and reinforced. There are a wealth of materials available for concept development in these areas for young children; it might be of value to utilize the ratio or cluster teacher as a resource person in these content areas. This approach might well serve the dual purpose of increasing the effectiveness of the ratio or cluster teacher (which was not rated highly in the present study) and of reducing what to many teachers was the present overemphasis on reading and reading readiness activities on the kindergarten level.

Play and learning, for children of kindergarten age, generally merge, particularly if the child has the opportunity to plan his activities. Although the play activities in which the children participating in the SECE Program engaged were generally rated as excellent, the ratings of the observers indicate that opportunities for planning were rarely provided. The picture presented by the observer is one in which the teacher is firmly in command of the selection and planning of activities in which the children engaged, and that, for the most part, the children were directed to quiet play and language development activities. Although the children engaged in conversation with the teacher, the paraprofessional, and with each other freely and without restraint, structured situations, in which language was developed around a common experience, were not encountered frequently. The ratings assigned by the observers indicate that the teachers' and other adults' use of experiences to develop observation and verbalization was less than "good." The development of structured and

sequential experiences that combine play and learning in content areas might well benefit the program on the kindergarten level. The activities described in existing Bulletins prepared by the Bureau of Curriculum Research, if implemented, would go far to improving the effectiveness of the Program on this level.

Turning from the instructional aspects of the Program to an administrative consideration, it had been expected that a larger proportion of non-English speaking children would be found in kindergarten classes, and decreasing proportions in first and second grade. On the whole, such a gradual decrease was noted, but in one-fourth of the schools with a population including non-English speaking children, the proportion of children learning English as a second language actually increased between kindergarten and first grade. This, of course, reflects the failure of many parents to enroll their children in kindergarten. Yet, even with the best of intentions, the SECE Program cannot provide for children who do not attend.

The problem of non-attendance was noted frequently by first grade teachers, who often referred to children who entered school in the first grade as "street" children, or "children from the street," a particularly unfortunate term. Many children who had not been exposed to a kindergarten experience evidenced difficulty in first grade; almost 15 per cent of first grade teachers felt that one of the major determinants of the child's reading progress in that grade was his attendance or non-attendance in kindergarten. Many of the teachers indicated that they had not been prepared to cope with the problems presented by these children.

Admittedly, the problem of non-enrollment is not an easy one for the

school to solve. In view of the pressing nature of the problem, however, the schools must take every step they can to insure that many children who are eligible for kindergarten as possible are permitted to register. This would entail the elimination of waiting lists for enrollment in kindergarten in all poverty area schools.

It may be possible, too, to enlist parents in a program designed to stimulate enrollment and regular attendance. The school's parent involvement program might include such activity as a segment; certainly the services of family assistants, if available, might be utilized to this end. Where possible, special provisions might be made for children whose parents must leave for work at unusual hours; some schools already have special arrangements for the care of children before or after the kindergarten session. Flexibility in scheduling is to be encouraged, as is parental involvement in child care ventures.

Recommendations

- a. Modification of the existing emphasis in current kindergarten programs, to include:
 - (1) Reduction of emphasis on reading readiness and/or reading activities, to be replaced by
 - (2) Greater emphasis on structured and sequential activities in content areas
- b. Exploration of the use of ratio teachers as resource personnel in content areas
- c. Greater implementation of existing curriculum bulletins applicable to ECE classes.

- d. Elimination of waiting lists for admission to kindergarten in poverty area schools
- e. Exploration of the use of family assistants and of parents in a program designed to improve kindergarten enrollment
- f. Permit wide measure of flexibility in organizing time schedules of kindergarten classes to permit increased registration

3. The Program in the First and Second Grades

To some extent, observations of the program as it was developed in the first and second grades led to much the same conclusion as observation of the kindergarten program - the teachers tended to function more adequately in the content areas, such as social studies, mathematics, and science. Here, too, the major emphasis on reading achievement seemed to have been achieved at the expense of other areas of learning. Recommendations on this level, then, would be much like those presented for the kindergarten level.

It was quite evident to the observers that the overall quality of teaching on the first grade level was somewhat below that noted in kindergarten classes, and that the quality of teaching in second grade was below that in first grade. In particular, grouping for instructional purposes was far from common. For the most part, total group instruction was the prevailing approach. The indications are, then, that a large proportion of the teachers are in need of furthering training in some areas - in providing for individual differences, in drawing on the experiences of children in lesson presentation, in providing for follow-up activities, in integration of curriculum areas in instruction.

A definitive judgement of the relative effectiveness of various types

of class organization (paired teachers, single teachers with paraprofessionals, single teachers without paraprofessionals) could not be made on the basis of the data available. There are many trends within the data that lead to the conclusion that there are many advantages that accrue when first and second grade teachers are afforded the services of a paraprofessional, and that many difficulties accompany the organization of paired classes. Differences may be seen in the reactions of observers and the expressed attitudes of participants. Again, the indications are that the practice of organizing paired classes should be examined very critically by school administrators and staff before a final decision is made to utilize this pattern of organization.

Recommendations

- a. Modify existing emphasis in first and second grade programs, to include:
 - (1) Reduction of emphasis on the mechanics of reading
 - (2) Greater emphasis on structured and sequential activities in content areas
- b. Explore the use of ratio teachers as resource personnel in content areas.
- c. Provide for greater implementation of curriculum bulletins dealing with ECE classes.
- d. Provide a comprehensive program of teacher training on the first and second grade levels. One element of this program should be directed to training of first grade teachers to work with children without previous experience in school.

- e. Undertake a very critical examination of prior experience with paired classes prior to establishing class organization for the coming school year.

4. Training Programs

In general, training programs for personnel associated with the SECE program tended to be poor. Indeed, in many schools, training programs for teachers and paraprofessionals were non-existent, in spite of the school principals' assurance that they were. In some cases, newly-appointed teachers were unaware that they were participating in a training program - it is not surprising that they failed to consider the monthly conference a training session, as did so many principals.

The complete lack of training programs in virtually one-fourth of the schools, and the weaknesses noted in such programs as were in existence, leads to the following recommendations:

Recommendations

- a. Organize effective training programs in all schools for teachers and paraprofessionals participating in the SECE Program.
- b. Budgetary allotment should be made available for the services of a teacher trainer, who would work with the principal and with the assistant principal in charge of ECE classes to formulate a program designed to meet the needs of the participants.

5. The Role of the School ECE Coordinator

In the early stages of the SECE Program, the position of school ECE Coordinator was mandated, and provision for such a position was made in determining the organization of the ECE program in each school. In the 1969-1970 school year, provision of such a position was permissive, and

many districts (and/or schools) elected to organize without providing for an ECE coordinator.

In the opinion of the evaluation team, the failure to mandate assignment of an ECE coordinator in every school participating in the Program was an error. The services of the ECE coordinator, particularly within the area of teacher training, were seen as extremely valuable by teachers, administrators, and observers.

Recommendations

- a. Mandate the establishment of a position for an ECE coordinator in every school participating in the SECE Program.
- b. The duties of the ECE coordinator should include a large measure of teacher training. (If an ECE coordinator is provided, the services of the teacher trainer referred to in the previous section need not be provided.)

6. The Role of the Paraprofessional

The fact that the paraprofessionals' perceptions of their role, their relationship with the teacher, and the problems encountered in the classroom do not differ substantially from the perceptions of professional personnel is important in the light of the role of the paraprofessional as "liason" between school and community. Not only are the paraprofessionals in a position to interpret the needs of the community to the teacher, but they may become effective change agents within the community with their experience and familiarity with school procedures and problems behind them. The school cannot perform miracles; its effectiveness relies greatly upon the quality of care the children

receive within the community. The paraprofessionals, with increasing insight into school and community, increasing experience and respect from the community may well cause important changes which will result in more effective education for the children.

The presence of a familiar, motherly figure in the classroom who respects the teacher and yet works well with her may have subtle, beneficial effects on the children's attitudes toward school and themselves.

In all respects, through individualized and small group teaching in the instructional program, in relieving the teacher of non-teaching routines, in serving as liason between school and community, and as a model for the children's development of positive self-attitudes and attitudes toward school, the position of the paraprofessional in the SECE Program was judged to be highly worthwhile, and the paraprofessionals holding these positions were considered as a group, to be highly effective. They may well become more effective with greater experience.

Recommendations

- a. The practice of assigning paraprofessionals to all kindergarten classes should be continued.
- b. The assignment of paraprofessionals to all classes in the SECE Program is recommended.

7. Parent Involvement Programs

It was very evident that the failure to develop an effective program of parent involvement was a major weakness of the SECE Program. The special activities described by principals were generally school-wide in nature, and not limited to parents of children in ECE classes. To such

parents, participation in a meeting discussing requirements for transfer to a junior high school may seem impersonal, artificial, and far removed from the needs of their children. Programs centered around each individual class, under the direction of the teacher, seem to have been much more effective, judging from teacher responses to interviews and questionnaires, as a means of encouraging positive parental involvement.

Class visits, by parents, followed by a social gathering or a more formal workshop session, were reported as an effective device for enlisting parental involvement; the experience of planning and preparing for the occasion may benefit the children directly. Perhaps the best program of parent involvement is an "open door policy." As one teacher stated, "the parents are always welcome in the room, and they know this." Or again, "the parents love coming to our little festivals at holiday time - our door is open..."

This stress upon the role of the individual classroom teacher in building relationships with parents should not be construed to mean that formal programs of parent involvement should be curtailed or dropped. To be sure, many teachers were unaware that a program of parent involvement had been undertaken in their schools. This simply means that there is great need for the involvement of all ECE teachers in programs specifically designed to meet the needs of parents of children enrolled in ECE classes.

Involvement of teachers, however, cannot be accomplished by fiat. Many teachers are not yet ready for working in the area of parent and community relations. Teachers, no matter how experienced, may well benefit from training in encouraging parent contact and participation,

in referring parents for services, in responding to criticism raised by parents, and in utilizing paraprofessional assistance most effectively in these respects.

Recommendations

- a. Programs of parental involvement should be established in those schools in which they do not exist.
- b. Existing programs of parental involvement should be strengthened, and efforts should be made to enlist the participation of all ECE teachers in these programs.
- c. A training program in the area of parent and community relations should be organized for teachers.
- d. The concept of the "open door" should be stressed in all programs seeking to develop parental involvement.

8. Programs for Non-English Speaking Children

One of the major problems of the SECE Program, as reported by paraprofessionals (including many non-Spanish paraprofessionals) was that of meeting the needs of the non-English speaking child. The numbers of such children in poverty area schools was large, ranging from an estimated 15 per cent of the pupil population in grade 2 to an estimated 20 per cent in kindergarten.

In each of the schools for which information was available, non-English speaking children received some special attention to help them learn English. For the most part, this took the form of small group instruction by an NE coordinator or TESL. Principals generally felt, in evaluating this type of approach to meeting the needs of the children,

that the services of the NE coordinators were excellent, but that the quantity of such service available to their schools was far from sufficient. As a consequence, there was a tendency to concentrate such services as were available in the upper grades, where the problem was more acute. In some schools, an attempt was made to compensate for this lack of trained personnel by placing non-English speaking children in classrooms where the services of a bilingual paraprofessional were available. This, of course, did not constitute a solution to the problem; these bilingual paraprofessionals generally had no training for the task of working with the non-English speaking child. As a matter of fact, none of the descriptions of programs for training of teachers and of paraprofessionals in the SECE Program that were available made any reference to a consideration of methods and materials for teaching non-English speaking children.

Recommendation

a. In order to supplement the limited available services of NE Coordinators and Teachers of English as a Second Language, it is recommended that training programs for teachers and paraprofessionals assigned to ECE classes include an introduction to methods and materials for teaching English as a Second Language.

APPENDIX A

STAFF PARTICIPATING IN EVALUATION PROGRAM

Director: Joseph Justman, Director, Institute for Research and Evaluation, School of Education, Fordham University

Research Assistant: Wendy Oxman, Institute for Research and Evaluation

Research Technician: Christine DeVita, Institute for Research and Evaluation

Statistical Consultant: Francis J. Crowley, Associate Professor, Fordham University

Consultant-Observers: Miriam Aranow, Associate Professor, LIU
 Claire Ashby, Instructor, Fordham University
 Anne Bravo, Assistant Professor, Fordham University
 Celia L. Cantor, Assistant Professor, Fordham University
 Joan M. Fairchild, Assistant Professor, Fordham University
 Miles R. Fairchild, Assistant Professor, Hunter College
 Nathan H. Field, Principal, NYC schools, Retired
 Shirley H. Flint, Associate Professor, Lehman College
 Esther Gitler, Teacher, NYC schools, Retired
 Nathan Jacobson, Supt. of Schools, Englewood, N.J.
 Eleanor A. Kelly, Instructor, Fordham University
 Ruth A. Korey, Associate Professor, Fordham University
 Elizabeth Malament, Associate Professor, Lehman College
 Ronald Manyin, Lecturer, Hunter College
 Ruth Manyin, Supervisor of Student Teachers, Hofstra
 Sue Moskowitz, Assistant Professor, Lehman College
 Vivian Sobeleski, Teacher, NYC Schools, Retired
 Olga Spellman, Principal, NYC Schools, Retired
 Helen R. Vaughn, Assistant Professor, Fordham University

Graduate Assistants: Eileen Luongo
Anne McBrearty
William Weichun
Mary White

Clerical Assistants: Scott Gilbert
Paul Mottola
Hilary Oxman

Secretary: Susan Imbornoni

APPENDIX B
INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE EVALUATION

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

ECE QUESTIONNAIRE - ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

School _____ District _____ Principal _____

A. TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

1. Undergraduate: College _____ Degree _____ Year _____

2. Graduate: College _____ Degree _____ Year _____

Total Number of Graduate Credits _____

3. Years of experience as principal prior to current year: _____

4. Years of experience in this school prior to current year: _____

5. Years of experience as AP: _____

6. Years of experience as elementary school teacher (Kg-6): _____

7. Years of experience as Early Childhood Education teacher: _____

B. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

1. Were you able to assign a teacher as an ECE coordinator in your school?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," how has the assignment of a coordinator affected the work load of your primary assistant principal (check one):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>_____ a. Much heavier</p> <p>_____ b. Somewhat heavier</p> <p>_____ c. The same</p> | <p>_____ d. Somewhat lighter</p> <p>_____ e. Much lighter</p> <p>_____ f. I don't know</p> |
|--|--|

2. Have the roles of the coordinator and of the ECE assistant principal been clearly differentiated?

Yes _____ No _____

If "no," please indicate areas of conflict or overlapping:

- a.
b.
c.

3. Please rate the effectiveness of your primary assistant principal and of your coordinator (if any) in furthering the objectives of the ECE program in your school (check one):

<u>A.P.</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>
_____ a. Excellent	_____ a. Excellent
_____ b. Good	_____ b. Good
_____ c. Fair	_____ c. Fair
_____ d. Poor	_____ d. Poor
_____ e. Very Poor	_____ e. Very Poor
_____ f. I don't know	_____ f. I don't know

4. Did your school organize an orientation or training program for ECE teachers during the current academic year?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please describe the nature of the program:

Please rate the effectiveness of this training program (check one):

_____ a. Excellent	_____ d. Poor
_____ b. Good	_____ e. Very Poor
_____ c. Fair	_____ f. I don't know

5. Did your school organize a training or orientation program for educational assistants assigned to early childhood classes during the current academic year?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please describe the nature of the program:

Please rate the effectiveness of this training program (check one):

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| _____ a. Excellent | _____ d. Poor |
| _____ b. Good | _____ e. Very Poor |
| _____ c. Fair | _____ f. I don't know |

6. Did your school organize a program to foster the greater involvement of parents in the early childhood program?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please describe the nature of the program:

Please rate the effectiveness of this program of parent involvement (check one):

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| _____ a. Excellent | _____ d. Poor |
| _____ b. Good | _____ e. Very Poor |
| _____ c. Fair | _____ f. I don't know |

C. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. What has been the effect of the total Strengthened ECE Program upon the kindergarten, grade 1, and grade 2 programs in your school? (Check one in each column):

<u>Effect</u>	<u>Kindergarten</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. Strongly positive	_____	_____	_____
b. Somewhat positive	_____	_____	_____
c. Neutral	_____	_____	_____
d. Somewhat negative	_____	_____	_____
e. Strongly negative	_____	_____	_____
f. I don't know	_____	_____	_____

2. What one element do you think has contributed most to the program?
(Check one):

- ☐ a. Reduced class size
- ☐ b. Assignment of ratio and/or cluster teachers
- ☐ c. Enthusiasm of teachers and other staff members
- ☐ d. Help of paraprofessionals
- ☐ e. More and better materials
- ☐ f. Involvement of parents
- ☐ g. Other (Specify) _____

3. How would you characterize the quantity and the quality of the service given to the program and the children by the following personnel?
(Check):

	<u>Quantity</u>			<u>Quality</u>		
	<u>Enough</u>	<u>Little</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
a. District ECE Coordinator	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. School Psychologist	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. School Social Worker	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Guidance Counselor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. NE Coordinator	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. School Doctor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. School Nurse	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

4. In what aspects of the program have the paraprofessionals been most helpful? (Check three):

- ☐ a. Controlling behavior of children
- ☐ b. Teaching children
- ☐ c. Keeping records
- ☐ d. Preparing materials
- ☐ e. Handling audiovisual material
- ☐ f. Relieving teacher of routines (milk, etc.)
- ☐ g. Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ h. _____

5. Considering each grade separately, what aspects of the program have shown the most improvement in your school? (Number the list below, using 1 to show the greatest improvement, etc.)

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. General academic progress of children	_____	_____	_____
b. Social behavior of children	_____	_____	_____
c. Relationship between school and parents	_____	_____	_____
d. Instructional techniques of teachers	_____	_____	_____
e. Teachers' control of class	_____	_____	_____
f. Materials of instruction used	_____	_____	_____
g. Individualization of instruction	_____	_____	_____
h. Creative expression of children	_____	_____	_____
i. Progress in reading	_____	_____	_____
j. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____
k. _____	_____	_____	_____

6. Of the following, check all of the items that have presented significant problems in the organization and implementation of the program in your school during the course of the year.

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. Classroom and other space	_____	_____	_____
b. Class size	_____	_____	_____
c. Materials, including audiovisual	_____	_____	_____
d. Parent relations	_____	_____	_____
e. Community relations	_____	_____	_____
f. Staff relationships	_____	_____	_____
g. Teacher Training (methods)	_____	_____	_____
h. Teacher Training (management, discipline)	_____	_____	_____
i. Overemphasis on reading	_____	_____	_____
j. Underemphasis on reading	_____	_____	_____
k. Teacher turnover (transfers, leaves, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
l. Pupil mobility (transfers)	_____	_____	_____
m. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____
n. _____	_____	_____	_____

7. Please give any additional comments that you feel may help the survey team evaluate the Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education.
(Use reverse side of page, if necessary)

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

ECE QUESTIONNAIRE - ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

School _____ District _____ Ass't Principal _____ Sex _____

A. TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

1. Undergraduate: College _____ Degree _____ Year _____

2. Graduate: College _____ Degree _____ Year _____

Total Number of Graduate Credits _____

3. Years of experience as AP prior to current year: _____

4. Years of experience as AP in this school, prior to current year: _____

5. Years of experience as elementary school teacher (Kg-6): _____

6. Years of experience as Early Childhood Education teacher: _____

B. SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

1. How many staff positions in your school are currently allotted to Kg., Grade 1, and Grade 2?

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. Paired teachers	_____	_____	_____
b. Single teachers	_____	_____	_____
c. Other teachers (Ratio, cluster, etc. list by type of position)			
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Paraprofessionals	_____	_____	_____
e. NE Coordinator	_____	_____	_____
f. Guidance Counselor	_____	_____	_____
g. Other (Specify): _____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

2. Was a teacher assigned as an ECE coordinator in your school?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," how has the assignment of a coordinator affected your work load? (Check one):

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| _____ a. Much heavier | _____ d. Somewhat lighter |
| _____ b. Somewhat heavier | _____ e. Much lighter |
| _____ c. The same | _____ f. I don't know |

3. Has your role and that of the coordinator been clearly differentiated?

Yes _____ No _____

If "no," please indicate areas of conflict or overlapping:

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

4. In which of the following bases were pupils assigned to first and second grade classes at the beginning of the school year? Please indicate number of classes on each grade to which pupils were assigned on the basis of:

	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
Homogeneous grouping (reading ability)	_____	_____
Homogeneous grouping (other area ability)	_____	_____
Homogeneous grouping (adjustment)	_____	_____
Homogeneous grouping (age)	_____	_____
Heterogeneous grouping	_____	_____
Other (Specify): _____	_____	_____

5. If any regularly scheduled subgroups in subject matter areas were organized on the first and second grade levels in your school, please indicate the number of such groups and their approximate size:

<u>Area</u>	<u>No. of Subgroups</u>	<u>Approximate Size</u>
Reading	_____	_____
Arithmetic	_____	_____
Other (Specify): _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

In your opinion, how effective was the technique of forming subgroups in fostering pupil achievement? (Check one):

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| _____ a. Very effective | _____ d. Somewhat ineffective |
| _____ b. Somewhat effective | _____ e. Very ineffective |
| _____ c. Neutral | _____ f. I don't know |

6. Approximate percent of children who speak English haltingly or not at all in:

Kindergarten _____ Grade 1 _____ Grade 2 _____

Is any special provision made for teaching English to those who speak it haltingly or not at all?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please describe:

7. Did your school organize an orientation or training program for ECE teachers during the current academic year?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please describe the nature of the program:

Please rate the effectiveness of this training program (check one):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ a. Excellent | ☐ d. Poor |
| ☐ b. Good | ☐ e. Very Poor |
| ☐ c. Fair | ☐ f. I don't know |

8. Did your school organize a training or orientation program for educational assistants assigned to early childhood classes during the current academic year?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If "yes," please describe the nature of the program:

Please rate the effectiveness of this training program (check one):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ a. Excellent | ☐ d. Poor |
| ☐ b. Good | ☐ e. Very Poor |
| ☐ c. Fair | ☐ f. I don't know |

9. Did your school organize a program to foster the greater involvement of parents in the early childhood program?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If "yes," please describe the nature of the program:

Please rate the effectiveness of this program of parent involvement (check one):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ a. Excellent | ☐ d. Poor |
| ☐ b. Good | ☐ e. Very Poor |
| ☐ c. Fair | ☐ f. I don't know |

C. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. In general, how would you characterize the instructional effectiveness of the teachers assigned to kindergarten classes? (Check one for each category present in your school):

	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>
a. Paired teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Single teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Ratio and cluster teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Paraprofessionals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Student teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Guidance Counselor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. NE Coordinator	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Other (Specify): _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. In general, how would you characterize the instructional effectiveness of teachers assigned to first grade classes in your school?

	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>
a. Paired teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Single teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Cluster and ratio teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Paraprofessionals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Student teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Guidance Counselor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. NE Coordinator	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Other (Specify): _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. In general, how would you characterize the instructional effectiveness of teachers assigned to second grade classes in your school?

	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>
a. Paired teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Single teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Ratio and cluster teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Paraprofessionals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Student teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Guidance Counselor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. NE Coordinator	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Other (Specify): _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

4. What has been the effect of the total Strengthened ECE Program upon the kindergarten, grade 1, and grade 2 programs in your school? (Check one in each column):

<u>Effect</u>	<u>Kindergarten</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. Strongly positive	_____	_____	_____
b. Somewhat positive	_____	_____	_____
c. Neutral	_____	_____	_____
d. Somewhat negative	_____	_____	_____
e. Strongly negative	_____	_____	_____
f. I don't know	_____	_____	_____

5. What one element do you think has contributed most to the program? (Check one):

- ☐ a. Reduced class size
☐ b. Assignment of ratio and/or cluster teachers
☐ c. Enthusiasm of teachers and other staff members
☐ d. Help of paraprofessionals
☐ e. More and better materials
☐ f. Involvement of parents
☐ g. Other (Specify): _____

6. In what aspects of the program have the paraprofessionals been most helpful in the classroom? (Check three):

- ☐ a. Controlling behavior of children
☐ b. Teaching children
☐ c. Keeping records
☐ d. Preparing materials
☐ e. Handling audiovisual material
☐ f. Relieving teacher of routines (milk, etc.)
☐ g. Other (Specify): _____
☐ h. _____

7. Considering each grade separately, what aspects of the program have shown the most improvement in your school? Number the list below, using 1 to show the greatest improvement, etc.

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. General academic progress of children	_____	_____	_____
b. Social behavior of children	_____	_____	_____
c. Relationship between school and parents	_____	_____	_____
d. Instructional techniques of teachers	_____	_____	_____
e. Teachers' control of class	_____	_____	_____
f. Materials of instruction used	_____	_____	_____
g. Individualization of instruction	_____	_____	_____
h. Creative expression of children (art, music, dance)	_____	_____	_____
i. Progress in reading	_____	_____	_____
j. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____
k. _____	_____	_____	_____

8. Of the following, check all of the items that have presented significant problems in the organization and implementation of the program in your school during the course of the year.

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. Classroom and other space	_____	_____	_____
b. Class size	_____	_____	_____
c. Materials, including audiovisual	_____	_____	_____
d. Parent relations	_____	_____	_____
e. Community relations	_____	_____	_____
f. Staff relationships	_____	_____	_____
g. Teacher Training (methods)	_____	_____	_____
h. Teacher Training (management, discipline)	_____	_____	_____
i. Overemphasis on reading	_____	_____	_____
j. Underemphasis on reading	_____	_____	_____
k. Teacher turnover (transfers, leaves, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
l. Pupil mobility (transfers)	_____	_____	_____
m. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____
n. _____	_____	_____	_____

9. Please give any additional comments that you feel may help the survey team evaluate the Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education.
(Use reverse side of page, if necessary)

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

QUESTIONNAIRE - DISTRICT SUPERVISORS, EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

District# _____ Number of Schools: In District _____ Participating in Program _____

Name of Supervisor _____

A. TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

1. Undergraduate: College _____ Degree _____ Year _____

2. Graduate: College _____ Degree _____ Year _____

Total Number of Graduate Credits _____

3. Years of experience as District ECE supervisor, prior to current year: _____

4. Years of experience in this district, prior to current year: _____

5. Years of experience as elementary school teacher (Kg-6): _____

6. Years of experience as ECE teacher: _____

B. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND EVALUATION

1. Were you involved in planning for the recycling of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program for the current school year?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," what was the nature of your participation in the planning phase? (Check those activities in which you engaged)

_____ a. Organizing workshops for school early childhood coordinators

_____ b. Organizing workshops for early childhood teachers

_____ c. Organizing workshops for paraprofessionals

_____ d. Consulting with school early childhood coordinators

_____ e. Consulting with early childhood teachers

_____ f. Consulting with paraprofessionals

- _____g. Consulting with school principals on teacher needs, class organization, etc.
- _____h. Preparing written guides for utilization of space and materials, etc.
- _____i. Determining school and district needs for personnel, materials, space, etc.
- _____j. Organizing workshops for parents
- _____k. Other (please specify) _____

2. What proportion of your time has been devoted to the various early childhood education programs in your district during the current academic year?

<u>Program</u>	<u>Time</u>
a. Prekindergarten	_____%
b. Kindergarten	_____%
c. Grade 1	_____%
d. Grade 2	_____%

3. What proportion of your time has been devoted to district activities not related to early childhood education during the current academic year?

_____%

4. Did your district organize a training program for teachers who would serve as school ECE coordinators during the current academic year?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please describe the nature of this training program:

Please rate the effectiveness of this training program for school ECE coordinators (check one):

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| _____a. Excellent | _____d. Poor |
| _____b. Good | _____e. Very Poor |
| _____c. Fair | _____f. I don't know |

5. Did your district organize a training or orientation program for early childhood teachers during the current academic year?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please describe the nature of this training program:

Please rate the effectiveness of this training program for ECE teachers (check one):

_____ a. Excellent

_____ d. Poor

_____ b. Good

_____ e. Very Poor

_____ c. Fair

_____ f. I don't know

6. Did your district organize a training or orientation program for early childhood paraprofessionals during the current academic year?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please describe the nature of this training program:

Please rate the effectiveness of this training program for paraprofessionals (check one):

_____ a. Excellent

_____ d. Poor

_____ b. Good

_____ e. Very Poor

_____ c. Fair

_____ f. I don't know

7. Did your district organize a program designed to foster parental involvement in the early childhood program?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please describe the nature of the program:

Please rate the effectiveness of this program of parental involvement:

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u> </u> a. Excellent | <u> </u> d. Poor |
| <u> </u> b. Good | <u> </u> e. Very Poor |
| <u> </u> c. Fair | <u> </u> f. I don't know |

8. How many schools in your district organized a training program for early childhood teachers? for educational assistants?

Teachers: Number of schools

Educational Assistants: Number of schools

9. What has been the effect of the total Strengthened ECE Program upon the kindergarten, grade 1, and grade 2 programs in the schools in your district? (Check one in each column):

	<u>Kindergarten</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. Strongly positive	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
b. Somewhat positive	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
c. Neutral	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
d. Somewhat negative	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
e. Strongly negative	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
f. I don't know	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

10. What one element do you think has contributed most to the program? (Check one):

- a. Reduced class size
 b. Assignment of ratio and/or cluster teachers
 c. Enthusiasm of teachers and other staff members
 d. Help of paraprofessionals
 e. More and better materials
 f. Involvement of parents
 g. Other (Specify)

11. In what aspects of the program have the paraprofessionals been most helpful in the classroom? (Check three):

- ☐ a. Controlling behavior of children
- ☐ b. Teaching children
- ☐ c. Keeping records
- ☐ d. Preparing materials
- ☐ e. Handling audiovisual materials
- ☐ f. Relieving teacher of routines (milk, etc.)
- ☐ g. Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ h. _____

12. Considering each grade separately, what aspects of the program have shown the most improvement in your district? Number the list below using 1 to show the greatest improvement, etc.)

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. General academic progress of children	_____	_____	_____
b. Social behavior of children	_____	_____	_____
c. Relationship between school and parents	_____	_____	_____
d. Instructional techniques of teachers	_____	_____	_____
e. Teachers' control of class	_____	_____	_____
f. Materials of instruction used	_____	_____	_____
g. Individualization of instruction	_____	_____	_____
h. Creative expression of children (art, music, dance)	_____	_____	_____
i. Progress in reading	_____	_____	_____
j. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____
k. _____	_____	_____	_____

13. Of the following, check all of the items that have presented significant problems in the organization and implementation of the program in your district during the course of the year:

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. Classroom and other space	_____	_____	_____
b. Class size	_____	_____	_____
c. Materials, including audiovisual	_____	_____	_____
d. Parent relations	_____	_____	_____
e. Community relations	_____	_____	_____
f. Staff relationships	_____	_____	_____
g. Teacher Training (methods)	_____	_____	_____
h. Teacher Training (management, discipline)	_____	_____	_____
i. Overemphasis on reading	_____	_____	_____
j. Underemphasis on reading	_____	_____	_____
k. Teacher turnover (transfers, leaves, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
l. Pupil mobility (transfers)	_____	_____	_____
m. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____
n. _____	_____	_____	_____

14. Please give any additional comments that you feel may help the survey team evaluate the Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education.
(Use reverse side of page, if necessary)

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

QUESTIONNAIRE - SCHOOL ECE COORDINATOR

School _____ District _____ Name _____ Sex _____

A. TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

1. Undergraduate: College _____ Degree _____ Year _____

2. Graduate: College _____ Degree _____ Year _____

Total Number of Graduate Credits _____

3. Years of teaching experience, prior to current year:

Kg - Gr. 2 _____ Gr. 3 - 6 _____ Secondary _____

4. Years at this school: _____

5. Years as School ECE coordinator: _____

B. YOUR ROLE AS ECE COORDINATOR

1. Were you involved in planning for the Early Childhood Program for the current year in your school?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," what was the nature of your participation in the planning phase? (Check those activities in which you engaged)

- ☐ a. Organizing workshops for early childhood teachers
- ☐ b. Organizing workshops for paraprofessionals
- ☐ c. Consulting with district early childhood coordinators
- ☐ d. Consulting with early childhood teachers
- ☐ e. Consulting with paraprofessionals
- ☐ f. Consulting with school principal on teacher needs, class organization, etc.
- ☐ g. Preparing written guides for utilization of space and materials
- ☐ h. Determining school needs for personnel, materials, space, etc.
- ☐ i. Organizing workshops for parents
- ☐ j. Other (Please Specify) _____

2. What proportion of your time has been devoted to the various early childhood education programs in your school during the current academic year?

<u>Program</u>	<u>Time</u>
a. Prekindergarten	_____ %
b. Kindergarten	_____ %
c. Grade 1	_____ %
d. Grade 2	_____ %

3. What proportion of your time has been devoted to school activities not related to early childhood education during the current academic year?

_____ %

4. Did your district organize a training program for teachers who would serve as school ECE coordinators during the current academic year?

Yes _____ No _____

Did you participate in this program? Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please rate the effectiveness of this training program (check one):

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| _____ a. Excellent | _____ d. Poor |
| _____ b. Good | _____ e. Very Poor |
| _____ c. Fair | _____ f. I don't know |

5. Did your school organize a training or orientation program for early childhood teachers during the current academic year?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please rate the effectiveness of this training program for teachers (check one):

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| _____ a. Excellent | _____ d. Poor |
| _____ b. Good | _____ e. Very Poor |
| _____ c. Fair | _____ f. I don't know |

How many hours per week did you spend in this training program with:

Kindergarten teachers _____

First Grade teachers _____

Second Grade teachers _____

Total _____

What other personnel helped you with organizing this training program?
(Check and indicate nature of help):

_____ Principal How? _____

_____ AP How? _____

_____ ECE Supervisor How? _____

_____ Other (Specify) How? _____

_____ How? _____

6. How many hours per week do you spend in teaching classes? _____

7. What is your teaching role (what classes do you teach? How often? etc.)

8. How many hours per week, on the average, do you spend in teacher training? _____

Number this list in order of amount of time spent, using 1 for the greatest amount of time and 6 for the least amount of time:

- _____ a. Training groups of teachers
- _____ b. Training individual teachers
- _____ c. Giving demonstration lessons
- _____ d. Helping teachers with learning problems of individual children
- _____ e. Helping teachers with behavior problems of individual children
- _____ f. Other (Specify): _____
- _____ g. _____

9. How many hours per week, on the average, do you spend in administration? _____

Number this list in order of amount of time spent, using 1 for the greatest amount of time:

- _____ a. Grouping classes
- _____ b. Ordering books and equipment
- _____ c. Assigning personnel (include paraprofessionals and student teachers)
- _____ d. Writing reports
- _____ e. Assigning use of classrooms and other space
- _____ f. Scheduling and arranging trips
- _____ g. Other (Specify) _____
- _____ h. _____

10. How many hours per week, on the average, do you spend in evaluation? _____

Number this list in order of amount of time spent, using 1 for the greatest amount of time:

- _____ a. Studying records of children
- _____ b. Grouping or regrouping
- _____ c. Preparing teachers for test administration
- _____ d. Giving tests
- _____ e. Constructing tests
- _____ f. Other (Specify) _____
- _____ g. _____

11. How many hours per week, on the average, do you spend in conferences with supervisors and other school personnel, exclusive of teachers and paraprofessionals? _____

Number this list in terms of frequency of contact, using 1 for the greatest number of contacts:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| _____ a. Principal | _____ e. NE Coordinator |
| _____ b. AP's | _____ f. School Nurse, Doctor |
| _____ c. District ECE Coordinator | _____ g. School Secretaries |
| _____ d. Guidance Counselor | _____ h. Other (Specify) _____ |

12. How many hours per week, on the average, do you spend in working with parents? _____

Number this list in terms of amount of time spent with parents, using 1 for the greatest amount of time:

- ☐ a. Interpreting school program
- ☐ b. Conferences about individual pupil
- ☐ c. Relationship between parent and teacher
- ☐ d. Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ e. _____

13. Number in order of importance, using 1 as most important, the areas in which you have been able to make a contribution to the ECE program:

- ☐ a. Teacher Training
- ☐ b. Administration
- ☐ c. Evaluation
- ☐ d. Contacts with supervisors
- ☐ e. Contacts with parents
- ☐ f. Materials and equipment

14. Have the roles of the coordinator and of the primary assistant principal been clearly differentiated in your school?

Yes _____ No _____

If "no," please indicate areas of conflict or overlapping:

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

C. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. What has been the effect of the total Strengthened ECE Program upon the kindergarten, grade 1, and grade 2 programs in your school? (Check one in each column):

<u>Effect</u>	<u>Kindergarten</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. Strongly positive	_____	_____	_____
b. Somewhat positive	_____	_____	_____
c. Neutral	_____	_____	_____
d. Somewhat negative	_____	_____	_____
e. Strongly negative	_____	_____	_____
f. I don't know	_____	_____	_____

2. What one element do you think has contributed most to the program?
(Check one):

- ☐ a. Reduced class size
- ☐ b. Assignment of ratio and/or cluster teachers
- ☐ c. Enthusiasm of teachers and other staff members
- ☐ d. Help of paraprofessionals
- ☐ e. More and better materials
- ☐ f. Involvement of parents
- ☐ g. Other (Specify) _____

3. In what aspects of the program have the paraprofessionals been most helpful in the classroom? (Check three):

- ☐ a. Controlling behavior of children
- ☐ b. Teaching children
- ☐ c. Keeping records
- ☐ d. Preparing materials
- ☐ e. Handling audiovisual material
- ☐ f. Relieving teacher of routines (milk, etc.)
- ☐ g. Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ h. _____

4. Considering each grade separately, what aspects of the program have shown the most improvement in your school? Number the list below, using 1 to show the greatest improvement, etc.)

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. General academic progress of children	_____	_____	_____
b. Social behavior of children	_____	_____	_____
c. Relationship between school and parents	_____	_____	_____
d. Instructional techniques of teachers	_____	_____	_____
e. Teachers' control of class	_____	_____	_____
f. Materials of instruction used	_____	_____	_____
g. Individualization of instruction	_____	_____	_____
h. Creative expression of children (art, music, dance)	_____	_____	_____
i. Progress in reading	_____	_____	_____
j. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____
k. _____	_____	_____	_____

5. Of the following, check all of the items that have presented significant problems in the organization and implementation of the program in your school during the course of the year.

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Grade 1</u>	<u>Grade 2</u>
a. Classroom and other space	_____	_____	_____
b. Class size	_____	_____	_____
c. Materials, including audiovisual	_____	_____	_____
d. Parent relations	_____	_____	_____
e. Community relations	_____	_____	_____
f. Staff relationships	_____	_____	_____
g. Teacher Training (methods)	_____	_____	_____
h. Teacher Training (management, discipline)	_____	_____	_____
i. Overemphasis on reading	_____	_____	_____
j. Underemphasis on reading	_____	_____	_____
k. Teacher turnover (transfers, leaves, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
l. Pupil mobility (transfers)	_____	_____	_____
m. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____
n. _____	_____	_____	_____

6. Please give any additional comments that you feel may help the survey team evaluate the Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education.
(Use reverse side of page, if necessary)

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

QUESTIONNAIRE - ECE TEACHERS

School _____ District _____ Teacher _____ Sex _____

Class _____ Type (Check): Paired _____ Single _____ Other _____

Register _____ Paraprofessional Assigned (Check): Yes _____ No _____

License now serving under: _____ Regular _____ Sub. _____

Position (Check): Classroom Teacher _____ Ratio or
Cluster Teacher _____ Other _____

A. TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

1. Undergraduate: College _____ Degree _____ Year _____
2. Graduate: College _____ Degree _____ Year _____
- Total Number of Graduate Credits _____
3. Years of teaching experience, prior to current year: _____
4. Years of teaching experience in this school prior to this year: _____
5. Years of experience as elementary school teacher (Kg-6): _____
6. Years of experience as Early Childhood Education Teacher: _____

B. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

1. Did your school organize an orientation or training program for ECE teachers during the current academic year?

Yes _____ No _____

Did you participate in this training program? Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please rate the effectiveness of this training program
(check one):

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| _____ a. Excellent | _____ d. Poor |
| _____ b. Good | _____ e. Very Poor |
| _____ c. Fair | _____ f. I don't know |

2. Did your school organize a training or orientation program for paraprofessionals assigned to early childhood classes during the current academic year?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please rate the effectiveness of this training program (check one):

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| _____ a. Excellent | _____ d. Poor |
| _____ b. Good | _____ e. Very Poor |
| _____ c. Fair | _____ f. I don't know |

3. Did your school organize a program to encourage greater involvement of parents in the early childhood program?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please rate the effectiveness of this program of parent involvement (check one):

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| _____ a. Excellent | _____ d. Poor |
| _____ b. Good | _____ e. Very Poor |
| _____ c. Fair | _____ f. I don't know |

4. How would you characterize the effect the ECE Program in your school has had on the learning achievement of the pupils in your class, in general? (Check one):

Very Good _____ Good _____ Fair _____ No Effect _____ Negative Effect _____

Please comment:

5. How would you characterize the effect the ECE Program in your school has had on the behavior of the pupils in your class, in general? (Check one):

Very Good _____ Good _____ Fair _____ No Effect _____ Negative Effect _____

Please comment:

To what aspects of the program do you ascribe this effect?

- What do you think of these materials and method?

- What were the major problems that arose as a result of sharing a room? (Consider class size, scheduling, storage, use of materials, grouping, etc.) Please describe:

- In what aspects of the program was the paraprofessional most helpful?
(Check three):

- 218

10. In general, how would you rate the books, audiovisual equipment, and other materials that you had to work with this year, in terms of a. sufficiency; b. quality; c. variety; and d. usefulness in your program:

	Very <u>Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	Very <u>Poor</u>
a. Sufficiency	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Quality	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Variety	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Usefulness	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please comment:

11. Do you think that the Program has had any effect on the relationship of the parents and the community with you as a teacher?

Yes _____ No _____ Not sure _____

Please comment:

12. All things considered, what has been the effect of the total ECE Program upon your class? (Check one):

_____ a. Strongly positive	_____ d. Somewhat negative
_____ b. Somewhat positive	_____ e. Strongly negative
_____ c. Neutral	_____ f. I don't know

13. What one element do you think has contributed most to the program? (Check one):

_____ a. Reduced class size

_____ b. Assignment of ratio teachers, cluster teachers

_____ c. Enthusiasm of teachers and other staff members

_____ d. Help of paraprofessionals

_____ e. More and better materials

_____ f. Involvement of parents

_____ g. Other (Specify) _____

14. Of the following, check all of the items that have presented significant problems in the organization and implementation of the program in your class during the course of the year:

- ☐ a. Use of classroom and other space
- ☐ b. Class size
- ☐ c. Materials, including audiovisual
- ☐ d. Parent relations
- ☐ e. Relationships between staff members
- ☐ f. Discipline of children
- ☐ g. Overemphasis on reading
- ☐ h. Underemphasis on reading
- ☐ i. Individualization of instruction
- ☐ j. Pupil mobility (transfers)
- ☐ k. Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ l. _____

15. Do you think the program should be continued next year?

Yes _____ No _____

If the program is continued next year, what recommendations would you make for changes in the way the program is carried out?

16. Please give any additional comments that you feel may help the survey team evaluate the Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education.
(Use reverse side of page, if necessary)

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

QUESTIONNAIRE - PARAPROFESSIONALS ASSIGNED TO ECE CLASSES

School _____ District _____ Name _____ Sex _____

A. EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE

1. How many years of school have you completed (Check one):

- ☐ a. I completed elementary school
- ☐ b. I completed one year of high school
- ☐ c. I completed two years of high school
- ☐ d. I completed three years of high school
- ☐ e. I have a high school diploma
- ☐ f. I have completed some college work
- ☐ g. I have a degree from a two year college
- ☐ h. I have a degree from a four year college

2. How many years of experience have you had as an educational assistant or a teacher aide, not counting this year? _____ years

3. How many years of experience have you had in this school? _____ years

B. YOUR DUTIES

1. How many hours per week do you work in this school? _____ hours

2. What are your most important duties? (Give the number of hours per week you spend in each of the following activities):

- ☐ a. Helping in kindergarten classes
- ☐ b. Helping in first grade classes
- ☐ c. Helping in second grade classes
- ☐ d. Helping with school supplies, audiovisual equipment, etc.
- ☐ e. Bus and hall duty
- ☐ f. Lunchroom duty
- ☐ g. Collecting funds (milk, lunch, etc.)
- ☐ h. Helping in school library
- ☐ i. Helping with clerical work in school office
- ☐ j. Assisting on trips
- ☐ k. Other (Describe): _____
- ☐ l. _____

3. Were you assigned to helping in a class for most of the time?

Yes _____ No _____

If you answered "yes," please check the grade level of the class:

Kindergarten _____ Grade 1 _____ Grade 2 _____ Other _____

What type of class were you assigned to?

Class with one teacher _____ Paired class (two teachers) _____

What were the most important ways in which you helped the teacher or teachers in the class? (List in order of importance):

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____
- d. _____
- e. _____

Do you think that the teacher felt that you helped her? Why?

C. WHAT YOU THINK ABOUT THE PROGRAM

1. What do you think have been the best things about the classroom in which you spent the most time this year?
2. What do you think have been the most important problems in the classroom in which you spent the most time?
3. What suggestions do you have for ways in which you could help in the classroom next year?
4. What suggestions do you have for improving the early childhood program in this school next year?

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

OBSERVATION OF KINDERGARTEN CLASSES

Observer _____ Date _____ School _____

Class _____ Register _____ Attendance _____ Note if AM, PM, All Day _____

Name of Teacher 1 _____ Name of Teacher 2 _____ Check: Para _____ Student Teacher _____

Directions: Rate the following aspects of the class observed, using the following scale:

Almost Always - 5 - Excellent
Usually - 4 - Good
Occasionally - 3 - Fair
Seldom - 2 - Poor
Almost Never - 1 - Very Poor
Not Applicable - 0 - Not Applicable

A. NATURE OF PLAY EXPERIENCE AND ACTIVITIES

- | | <u>Rating</u> |
|--|---------------|
| 1. Children participate in planning play experiences with the opportunity for self-selection of activities | _____ |
| 2. Children are free from strain, smile or laugh, chatter | _____ |
| 3. Children are actively engaged in some satisfying activity | _____ |
| 4. Play materials in use suitable to age level of children | _____ |
| 5. Play materials easily accessible and in good condition for use. | _____ |
| 6. Use of available play space | _____ |

7. Play equipment in use (Check one space for each item):

<u>Equipment designed to:</u>	<u>In Available,</u>		<u>Not</u>
	<u>Use</u>	<u>Not in Use</u>	<u>Available</u>
a. Stimulate large muscle activity (climbing, lifting, pulling, pushing)	_____	_____	_____
b. Promote cooperative play	_____	_____	_____
c. Promote dramatic play	_____	_____	_____
d. Stimulate expression of ideas and feelings (blocks, music, clay, paints)	_____	_____	_____
e. Encourage quiet activities (pictures, books, flannel board)	_____	_____	_____
f. Encourage manipulative skill (puzzles, nesting blocks, cones, cylinders)	_____	_____	_____
g. Encourage "looking-glass self" (Negro dolls, books with illustrations of black and PR children)	_____	_____	_____

8. Range of content of play activity (check those observed)

- _____ a. Domestic
- _____ b. Construction
- _____ c. Toys (trains, boats, cars, etc.)
- _____ d. Dramatic (puppets, costume play, etc.)
- _____ e. Manipulation (puzzles, pegboards, etc.)
- _____ f. Sand table, water play
- _____ g. Rhythms (instruments, rocking horse, etc.)
- _____ h. Art (clay, dough, crayons, paints, collage)
- _____ i. Dictated writing
- _____ j. Library (books, story records, filmstrips)
- _____ k. Outdoors play
- _____ l. Other (Specify) _____

9. OVERALL RATING OF PLAY EXPERIENCE

B. LANGUAGE IN THE CLASSROOM

	<u>Rating</u>
1. Teachers (other adults) ask questions that stimulate oral response and discussion	_____
2. Responses and gestures of teachers (other adults) indicate that they are listening to child and understand what he is saying	_____
3. Teachers (other adults) give specific attention to language development of non-English speaking children (identifying objects by name, encouraging child to talk, supplying words, etc.)	_____
4. Teachers (other adults) use incidental and planned experiences to develop observation and related verbalization	_____
5. Child-teacher (-adult) communication is free and open, without apparent hesitation and restriction	_____
6. Child-child communication is active, vital, and flowing	_____
7. Specific language activities engaged in by <u>children</u> , with or without adult supervision (check either or both media, and indicate if supervised by teacher or paraprofessional):	

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Speaking</u>	<u>Listening</u>	<u>Supervised by</u>	
			<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Para</u>
a. Conversation	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Planning	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Explaining	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Discussion	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Telling stories	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Retelling stories	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Telephoning	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Dramatization	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Speaking to groups	_____	_____	_____	_____
j. Asking questions	_____	_____	_____	_____
k. Stating needs	_____	_____	_____	_____
l. Greetings, farewells	_____	_____	_____	_____
m. Telling experiences	_____	_____	_____	_____
n. Giving directions	_____	_____	_____	_____
o. Delivering messages	_____	_____	_____	_____
p. Radio	_____	_____	_____	_____
q. TV	_____	_____	_____	_____
r. Music, rhythms	_____	_____	_____	_____
s. Movies	_____	_____	_____	_____
t. Puppet show	_____	_____	_____	_____
u. Poetry	_____	_____	_____	_____
v. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
w. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____

8. Reading Readiness Activities observed (such as auditory discrimination, visual discrimination, directionality, alphabet, etc.): Describe briefly, indicating activity, materials used, number of children participating:

9. Beginning Reading Activities Observed (such as experience charts, basic reader, word cards, phonics, ITA, etc.). Describe briefly, indicating activity, materials used, number of children participating:

10. OVERALL RATING OF LANGUAGE IN THE CLASSROOM _____

C. OTHER CONTENT AREAS

Rating

1. Teachers (other adults) structure or take advantage of on-going classroom activities to build understanding of basic mathematical concepts (asks "how many," "which one"; one-to-one correspondence - one child, one chair, etc.; calls attention to sets of objects and children; geometrical shapes; contrasts, such as big-little, heavy-light; ordinals, first block, second block, etc.; games, such as dominoes; uses number line; counting for attendance, snacks, etc.) _____
2. Teachers (other adults) structure specific group activities; to develop science concepts (use of simple machines to do work; experiments with plants; floating objects; magnets; etc.) _____
3. Teachers (other adults) structure experiences that focus upon the children's own and differing environment (pictures, discussion, trips, guests) _____
4. Teachers (other adults) encourage good health and safety practices in classroom living _____
5. Teachers (other adults) use literature in a way that creates enthusiasm and enjoyment of literature (picture storybooks, story-telling, poetry, fingerplay) _____
6. Teachers (other adults) guide children in finding satisfaction and pleasure in music _____
7. Teachers (other adults) use art experiences to explore media independent of adult intervention and qualitative judgment _____
8. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTION IN OTHER CONTENT AREAS _____

D. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Rating

1. Children are given responsibility for routine activities
(clean-up, watering plants, pouring juice, serving cookies, etc..) _____
2. Character of transitions (play to clean-up, clean-up to snack
time, etc.) _____
3. Teacher flexibility (in routine activities, arrangement of
furniture, use of materials, etc.) _____
4. Teachers (other adults) utilize classroom living procedures
and attitudes to foster sharing, acceptance of rights and
responsibilities of self and others _____
5. OVERALL RATING OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT _____
- E. RATING OF OVERALL OBSERVATION _____

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

OBSERVATION OF LESSON - FIRST AND SECOND GRADES

Observer _____ Date _____ School _____

Class _____ Register _____ Attendance _____ Note if AM or PM only _____

Teacher 1 _____ Teacher 2 _____ Check: Para _____ Student Teacher _____

1. Type of lesson observed, including aim of lesson:

2. Brief description of lesson content taught by teacher(s):

3. Duration of lesson: From _____ to _____ Total Time (minutes) _____

4. Pattern(s) of organization used during lesson (circle appropriate letters):
 - a. Total class instruction by one teacher
 - b. Two groups; each with adult (Specify adults, size of groups, activity of each group):
 - c. Two groups; one with adult, other working independently (Specify size of groups, activity of each group):
 - d. More than two groups; each with adult (Specify adults; size of groups, activity of each group):
 - e. Independent study; all children using same materials (Describe):

f. Individualized study; children using varied materials; adults circulating (Describe):

g. Any other pattern (Describe):

Please rate the following aspects of the lesson observed, using the following scale:

Excellent - 5	Poor - 2
Good - 4	Very Poor - 1
Fair - 3	Not Applicable - 0

- | | <u>Rating</u> |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Lesson is well planned and organized | _____ |
| 2. Lesson type and level of content are suitable for children in class | _____ |
| 3. Lesson is paced to needs and personality of children | _____ |
| 4. Teacher evaluates and encourages children to evaluate learnings. | _____ |
| 5. Emphasis of lesson is on development of concepts and understandings rather than only on drill and memorization | _____ |
| 6. Experiences of children are drawn on | _____ |
| 7. Provision is made for follow-up based on interest or needs
Describe: | _____ |
| 8. Teacher uses opportunities to relate concepts and learnings to other areas of curriculum | _____ |
| 9. Children are aware of what they are learning | _____ |
| 10. Teacher talks clearly and at a suitable volume | _____ |
| 11. Teacher encourages thinking and oral language through use of stimulating questions | _____ |
| 12. Teacher uses praise and encouragement; avoids reproof as much as possible | _____ |
| 13. Many children participate, comment, explain, ask questions, discuss, demonstrate | _____ |

Rating

14. Teacher uses good techniques for involving slower as well as faster learners _____
15. Most children are alert, interested, eager, but not tense during instruction _____
16. In general, children appear to have learned what teacher aimed to teach _____
17. Materials used during lesson suitable in content and level of difficulty _____
18. When total class is not taught as a single group, activities provided for other children are suitable, worthwhile _____
19. Materials used by independent groups or individuals are suitable in content and level of difficulty _____
20. Independent groups or individuals work consistently at assigned or other tasks _____
21. Work done by independent groups or individuals is checked and supervised in some way (State how): _____
22. General estimate of teacher's instructional ability, based on this lesson _____
23. General estimate of teacher's control of class during lesson ... _____
24. General estimate of teacher's use of paraprofessional during lesson _____

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

OVERALL APPRAISAL OF CLASS AND TEACHER - FIRST AND SECOND GRADE

Observer _____ Date _____ School _____ Class _____

Teacher 1 _____ Teacher 2 _____ Check: Para _____ Student Teacher _____

A. Rate the following aspects of the class observed, using the following scale:

Almost Always - 5	Seldom - 2
Usually - 4	Hardly Ever - 1
Occasionally - 3	Not Applicable - 0

- | | <u>Rating</u> |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Relationships between children are friendly, cooperative | _____ |
| 2. Children communicate freely, with little yelling, pushing, interrupting | _____ |
| 3. Children show independence and help one another in dressing, working, etc. | _____ |
| 4. Children tend to use sentences rather than words or phrases in communicating | _____ |
| 5. Children appear to like school; general atmosphere of class free from tension | _____ |
| 6. Children are friendly and courteous to teacher and other adults. | _____ |
| 7. Children show confidence in teacher and other adults; ask for help when needed; are not unduly demanding | _____ |
| 8. Children accept directions of adults promptly, without hostility | _____ |
| 9. Teacher avoids overdomination; children given opportunities for initiative or leadership | _____ |
| 10. Relationship between teachers sharing room is positive | _____ |

	<u>Rating</u>
11. Relationship between teacher and paraprofessional is friendly, cooperative, confident	_____
12. Emotional climate of classroom is warm and positive	_____
13. Quiet learning activities are interspersed with play, body activity, or rest	_____
14. Grouping patterns vary with different activities	_____
15. Attention is given to learnings of individual children as well as total class and small groups	_____
16. Classroom routines and management by teacher are well developed and effective	_____
17. Paraprofessional actively participates in children's functioning and learning activities	_____
18. Room is attractively furnished and decorated, not cluttered	_____
19. Furniture is suitable to children; functionally arranged	_____
20. Classroom space is well utilized	_____
21. Toilet and washing facilities are easily accessible	_____
22. Exit to street is easily accessible	_____
23. Safety precautions appear to be well observed both in physical facilities and class management	_____

B. Materials (books, audiovisual, creative, etc.) observed in use or on hand with classroom (check appropriate column):

	<u>Plentiful, Varied</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Sparse, Not Present</u>
1. Reading (library or recreational reading)	_____	_____	_____
2. Reading (workbooks)	_____	_____	_____
3. Reading (readers and other skills material)	_____	_____	_____
4. Other Language Arts	_____	_____	_____
5. Science	_____	_____	_____
6. Math	_____	_____	_____
7. Art	_____	_____	_____
8. Music	_____	_____	_____
9. Physical Activities	_____	_____	_____
10. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____
11. _____	_____	_____	_____

C. Activities observed that involved 5 or more children, and lasted at least five minutes (Check):

_____ 1. Planning	_____ 10. Art
_____ 2. Discussion	_____ 11. Music
_____ 3. Language Development	_____ 12. Storytelling
_____ 4. Demonstration by child	_____ 13. Teacher reading aloud
_____ 5. Physical education	_____ 14. Experimentation
_____ 6. Play	_____ 15. Recreational reading
_____ 7. Rest	_____ 16. Dancing
_____ 8. Research	_____ 17. Other (Specify) _____
_____ 9. "Drill"	_____ 18. _____

D. Grouping Patterns: Note approximate proportion of total observation time in which pupils learned:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| 1. As a total class group | _____ |
| 2. In small groups | _____ |
| 3. As individuals | _____ |
| 4. In a combination of 2 and 3 | _____ |

E. Activities: Mark the following activities in order (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) of time spent by adults in classroom, using 1 for greatest:

	<u>Teacher 1</u>	<u>Teacher 2</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Student Teacher</u>
1. Teaching class	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Teaching small groups	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Teaching individuals	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Discipline	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Housekeeping	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Checking work	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Record keeping	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Other (Specify) _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____